DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 338 748 UD 028 367

TITLE The Boston/Chelsea Urban Team after One Year.
INSTITUTION Massachusetts State Dept. of Education, Quincy.
PUB DATE Oct 90
NOTE 82p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; *Educational Change; Educational Objectives; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Program Effectiveness; Remedial Programs; School Choice; School Districts; Special Education; *State Programs; Student Placement; Urban Problems; *Urban Programs; Urban Schools; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Boston Public Schools MA; *Chelsea School System MA

ABSTRACT

A conscious strategy for educational reform has guided the 1990 efforts of the Boston/Chelsea (Massachusetts) Urban Team. Elements of the strategy include the following: (1) acknowledging that the individual school, not the state or federal program, is the fundamental unit of education; (2) breaking down the compartmentalization of bilingual, special, remedial, and vocational education; (3) using parent choice of schools as an agent for school reform; (4) raising and meeting expectations for poor children; and (5) modeling behavior in the Massachusetts State Department of Education (MSDE) that should be copied in the schools. The nine objectives established for the Boston schools are reviewed, and progress toward each is discussed. Problems with student assignment to schools have been among the roadblocks to reform in Boston. On the plus side, 18 elementary schools and middle schools designated "Schools that Are Restructuring" (STAR) have benefitted from funding and extensive technical assistance. In Chelsea, reform efforts followed and made progress toward eight specific objectives. Nine new objectives are proposed for both cities, and implications for the MSDE are discussed. The integration of bilingual education into the rest of the school program provides a good example of the cooperative and problem-solving model the Boston/Chelsea team advocates. Appendices comprise the following: (1) recommendations on modifications to the student assignment plan in Boston; and (2) materials for the STAR program. The paper includes four references. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

MASSACHUSETTS BOARD OF EDUCATION

James F. Crain, Gloucester, *Chairperson*
Dr. Raquel Bauman Holden, *Vice Chairperson*
John J. Gould, Boston
William K. Irwin, Jr. ,Wilmington
Joseph E. Killory, Sandwich
Anne S. Larkin, Bedford
Edward T. Moore, Jr., Bellingham
Dr. Richard R. Rowe, Belmont
Theodora A. Sylvester, Springfield
Frances M. Turner, South Egremont
Dr. Joan Wallace-Benjamin, Boston
Frederick A. Wang, Needham

Harold Raynolds, Jr., Commissioner of Education, *Secretary*

Chancellor Franklyn Jenifer, Chancellor, Board of Regents, *Ex Officio*

Boston/Chelsea Team
Charles L. Glenn, PhD, EdD, *Director*
Doreen H. Wilkinson, EdD, *Director*

Produced by the Boston/Chelsea Team
Yvonne LaLyre, *cover*
Rocco Lo Russo, *Senior Offset Duplicate Machine Operator*

The Massachusetts Department of Education insures equal employment/educational opportunities/affirmative action regardless of race, color, creed, national origin or sex, in compliance with Title VI and Title IX, or handicap, in compliance with section 504.

Publication# 16470, 85 pages, Approved by Ric Murphy, *State Purchasing Agent*.

Boston/Chelsea Urban Team
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169-5183

THE BOSTON/CHELSEA URBAN TEAM

AFTER ONE YEAR

STRATEGY 2

MANAGEMENT AND RESOURCES 4

BOSTON 6

CHELSEA 14

NEW INITIATIVES 17

REFORMING URBAN EDUCATION 18

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT 21

Appendix: Recommendations on Modifications to the Boston Student Assignment Plan

Appendix: STAR (Schools That Are Restructuring) materials

October 1990

TO: Commissioner Raynolds

FROM: Charles Glenn CG

This pilot state effort to strengthen urban education, launched a year ago, has produced solid results:

- parent choice has been put powerfully to work in support of school improvement and integration of pupils, teachers, and expectations for learning
- working with individual schools in a new style has created a problem-solving cooperative spirit between school system and state staff
- bureaucratic compartmentalization of programs has been broken down in the interest of increased educational coherence and effectiveness
- Boston is at last committed to making fundamental decisions about the structure of secondary education, expectations for all pupils, tracking and retention, the authority of school and zone administrators, and the reform and integration of bilingual, occupational and special education
- Chelsea has also begun to make such decisions, a function not only of manageable size but also of Boston University's role; at least as important as the funding and expertise provided by BU has been its ability to cut through the paralysis of effective decision-making and follow-through

Much has begun to change for the better in Boston and Chelsea schools, but these fragile changes require a friendly environment of state and city policies that put schools and classrooms above bureaucratic routine.

State efforts to reform urban education must be based upon clear strategies aimed at changing the environment within which principals lead, teachers teach, and parents, teachers, principals and secondary students set goals and work together to achieve them.

STRATEGY

The Boston/Chelsea effort has been guided from its inception by a conscious strategy for educational reform. The elements of this strategy, although articulated in state policy documents over a number of years, had never been put effectively into practice.

They include:

- the individual school, and not the state or federal program, is the fundamental unit of education; this implies putting the coherence and effectiveness of the school above compliance with program guidelines, if they conflict

- children learn in relation to other children, as well as to teachers and materials; this implies breaking down the compartmentalization of bilingual, special, remedial and vocational education pupils, teachers and goals

- parent choice of schools, properly organized, can be a powerful agent for school reform; this implies giving school staff the freedom to educate differently, while holding them accountable if the results do not serve children and parents well

- equal educational opportunity for poor children is not served by letting down standards, but precisely by raising expectations while creating schools in which these expectations can be met; this implies fundamental change in how secondary education is organized and provided

- the Department of Education will not become truly helpful to urban education until we recognize the ways in which we have been part of the problem; this implies modeling in our own behavior that which we hope to encourage in school system staff

On October 20th last year I sent you a memorandum which you shared with the Board of Education, outlining the organization and goals of the special unit that you had decided to set up to work in a new manner with Boston

and Chelsea. Passages indented below are taken from that "charter memorandum".

The Boston/Chelsea Urban Team did not actually become operational until January of this year and, as will be noted below, it is still not staffed to carry out its mission in some crucial areas. In part this is the result of the Department's general staffing crisis, but the B/C Team also remains severely understaffed in comparison with the four regional education centers.

The purpose of this report is to review the progress that we have made on each of our original objectives, and how these objectives have changed as the situation in each city has evolved.

In the October 1989 memo I wrote:

> "Discussion of school reform frequently stresses that it has been a mistake to tie up principals and teachers with procedural requirements, while letting them off the hook of producing results. Schools should have more freedom, we say, to determine how they will achieve results, in exchange for increased accountability for outcomes. I am proposing that the Boston/Chelsea Team function on the same basis. Once the goals have been accepted, we should be free to work to achieve them with a minimum of constraint by bureaucratic considerations. . . .
>
> "Our efforts, and I include my own, to respond to the educational needs of urban children have been too rigid and timid. In Boston and in Chelsea the moment is propitious for bold advances, worked out with teachers and administrators. Anything less than that will amount to business-as-usual. The Department's Team must be free to respond positively to readiness for fundamental change, in a system or zone superintendent, a program manager, or the faculty of a school.
>
> "If the guidelines of any federal program conflict with doing what is needed to make

> schools more effective, we will expect support in seeking waivers of those guidelines. Similarly, if the requirements of any state program get in the way of doing the right thing, we will expect appropriate flexibility. This is the spirit of the Carnegie School program, applied to urban education, where it is most needed."

Despite these brave words, and the general support that they received at the time, it has been a long process to develop a new approach to funding and monitoring procedures. We are painfully aware that some of our colleagues regard the Boston/Chelsea effort as dubious.

Old habits die hard, and the "vertical integration" of state, local central office, and school-level specialists in each program area, while frequently positive in itself, can greatly complicate or prevent entirely the collaboration across program lines that must be the heart of real reform in educating children.

It is not enough to encourage schools to plan and organize to function in a new, more-effective way or to take advantage of parent choice to develop distinctive strategies for education **if the behavior of central office and state officials remains unchanged.**

MANAGEMENT AND RESOURCES

> "A new unit will be established in the Office of the Commissioner; you have designated me to head this unit on a one-year assignment, in addition to continuing to head the Office of Educational Equity. I have asked that another manager be assigned to work with me on this project."

The unit has been established and adequate space assigned. Dr. Doreen Wilkinson is serving extremely ably as co-director, with responsibility for funding programs and school improvement efforts, while I am responsible for compliance and policy issues.

Contrary to expectations, the team has not been staffed in a way that reflects its responsibilities for two cities with a concentration of high-need pupils, including one-third of the low-achieving "opportunity schools" and 46% of the black pupils in the Commonwealth. For example:

(a) with 26% of the bilingual program enrollment statewide (compared with 10% in Central Massachusetts and 12% in Southeastern Massachusetts), the Team has no bilingual specialist assigned;

(b) with 22% of the pupils in the Commonwealth from families on AFDC, the Team has only a part-time 03 to monitor and support Chapter 1 programs;

(c) with notoriously inadequate occupational education programs, there are no staff assigned to provide specialized technical assistance as part of the Team's work with middle and high school restructuring;

(d) of more than a dozen GBREC professional staff formerly assigned to work with Boston and Chelsea, only one is now assigned to the Boston/Chelsea Team.

The total staffing of the Team consists of four professional and two clerical staff, and two part-time "03" temporary staff. Dr. Wilkinson is providing leadership full-time (at least!), while I devote half-time to this effort and half-time to the Office of Educational Equity's statewide responsibilities (assisted by three professional and one clerical staff, down by three professionals since 1989)..

An Advisory Council, broadly representative of parent, student, community and professional groups in the two cities, has been meeting since January to deal with a different issue each month, including high school reorganization, special education, advanced work classes, the share of state discretionary funding going to cities, adult education/GED, among others.

The Advisory Council, which is chaired by former Board member Loretta Roach, meets each month at a different Boston or Chelsea school.

BOSTON

[from October 1989 memo]

> "(1) The student assignment plan will be revised and extended to all grades k-8 in a timely fashion through discussions with all parties. This process will make appropriate provision for bilingual and special education, including sufficient capacity in regular classes for partial and full mainstreaming, and will complete all decisions about the use of facilities and the location of programs by March 1, 1990."

This objective was met in a satisfactory manner last Spring, but implementation of bilingual education assignments (and reservation of space for partial mainstreaming) has been damaged by Boston's budget crisis.

In addition, the failure of the School Department to resolve issues of **operational responsibility for the parent information and assignment process**, caused many avoidable problems for parents and schools, blunting the power of choice as an impetus for change in schools and in the system as a whole.

"Controlled choice," a technique of student assignments developed in Massachusetts, is the most effective approach to desegregation ever developed <u>if</u> it is implemented in a flexible and pro-active manner. The more energetically <u>choice</u> is promoted, the less need there is to stress <u>control</u> and the more educational improvement will become everybody's concern.

The style in which the Department of Implementation has managed the assignment process this year has stressed elaborate procedural controls at the expense of putting choice to work for parents and for schools. As a result, there have been many complaints that parent information center staff could not provide accurate advice or on-the-spot assignments, as intended. Thus many parents end up frustrated, as are school staff who are seeking to recruit pupils.

We met recently with Superintendent McDonough to recommend a fundamental reorganization, with responsibility and authority for the parent information and assignment process clearly in the hands of the zone superintendents (see attached memorandum).

> "(2) This student assignment plan will make provisions for kindergarten that (a) respond more adequately to the demand for extended-day programs, (b) assure desegregated first grades in subsequent years with minimal reassignment of pupils, and (c) strengthen the three early learning centers."

Despite urging from the state and from parent groups concerned with problems that arose last year, the School Committee refused to grapple with the distribution of and assignment rules governing kindergarten, apparently more concerned with pleasing parents who withdraw their children from the public schools before (desegregated) first grade than with serving parents committed to the system, and their children.

The Committee also insisted upon conducting kindergarten registration at the individual schools, over the Board of Education's strong objections; this has led to the predicted assignment problems, including many children unassigned because their parents had not been counselled into including schools with available space among their selections.

Our assignment recommendations (attached) would, if implemented, resolve these issues. They are based upon extensive discussions with parent information center staff, with an ad hoc group of parents pulled together by the Citywide Educational Coalition, and with many individuals.

> "(3) A secondary school assignment plan will be discussed with all parties and adopted in a timely fashion. This plan will (a) provide for effective use of the ORC, together with greatly expanded access to occupational education (b) incorporate the

provisions of the system's drop-out prevention strategy, (c) identify the educational theme of each secondary school, and show how it will be translated into reality, and (d) make adequate and stable provision for bilingual and special education."

The new high school assignment procedures were implemented fairly smoothly, in large part because the Zone Superintendent developed them and took a major role in their implementation. The fact that, given a choice, students sought to avoid assignment to a number of high schools should be a powerful impetus to improvement of those schools.

(a) Enrollment has increased significantly at Madison Park/Humphrey Center (the "ORC"), where under-utilization of vocational education facilities had long concerned us.

(b) High school restructuring efforts at six schools (see below, #4) address in a promising way the elements of a drop-out prevention strategy. Drastic cuts in state funds for this purpose have been a severe blow, but we have stressed that commitment must be school-wide and not dependent upon supplemental resources.

(c) The high school "magnet themes," funded by a federal grant that was not coordinated with school improvement efforts, were insufficiently developed to have much impact upon applications. We have discussed with Superintendent McDonough the importance of expecting each high school to offer experiences and develop skills based upon one or more distinctive areas of career and "real world" interest. Choice-based assignments to high schools (even if desegregation were not a requirement) must rest upon making every high school genuinely attractive to and effective for a particular group of students.

(d) Special education provision has been reorganized to provide high-incidence services at most high schools, and we are continuing to press for expanded support at the examination schools. Fundamental decisions must be made about how home-language support

can most effectively be provided to secondary students, and the system's new Bilingual Advisory Council is making this its first order of business.

You recently reminded Superintendent McDonough that the Boston School Committee must make fundamental decisions about secondary education in these and other areas before solid improvements will be possible, and he and Subcommittee Chair Rosina Bowman have expressed their commitment to presenting these decisions to the Committee. The Boston/Chelsea Team has participated in many useful discussions of the shape that an effective **system** of secondary education (without which it is not ultimately possible for individual schools to be effective) might take; the seriousness with which these discussions are at least beginning to deal with the issues is quite encouraging. We have urged that only **radical changes** will be adequate to the seriousness of the situation faced by thousands of Boston pupils.

The draft plan that is now being circulated addresses in a thoughtful way the structure of individual high schools, consistent with the process now taking place in six of them (see below). It does not yet grapple with other issues that we believe should be included in the final plan: bilingual education, the "two-tier" structure of the system, clear expectations for what every pupil should learn, occupational education system-wide, and other issues covered in your recent letter. Superintendent McDonough has assured us that these issues will be addressed in the final document.

We are also encouraged by the commitment of the School Committee to a careful study of the impact of retention and tracking practices on prospects for student success. Retention was identified as a problem in our report on assignments last year, and in a subsequent state policy paper, while tracking was the focus of a major study by the Massachusetts Advocacy Center. Superintendent McDonough has asked for the assistance of the Boston/Chelsea Team in the process of developing policy options in these sensitive areas.

"(4) In cooperation with the High School zone superintendent and his School Improvement Council, provide for and support a process of school-level planning and restructuring to promote educational equity and effectiveness in at least four high schools, and outreach to all pupils and parents as they select among the options available. Make state and federal resources available in a flexible manner to support these efforts."

Six high schools are engaged in a restructuring process funded through the Team, reflecting an integrated grant and program approach and drawing upon the Department's recommendations for secondary school reform. Staff teams from the six schools participated in two weeks of planning and training this summer. High School Zone Superintendent Michael Fung has given vigorous leadership to this effort, with support from the Zone Improvement Council.

"(5) In cooperation with the East, West and North zone superintendents and their School Improvement Councils, work with at least ten elementary and middle schools that need to increase their effectiveness as measured by academic outcomes and also their attractiveness as measured by parent selections.

"Make state and federal resources available in a flexible manner to support these efforts."

This objective is being met in a very satisfactory manner, thanks to an intensive collaboration between school department and state staff, including productive weekly meetings. Zone Superintendents Grassa-O'Neill, Janey and Bage have thrown their support behind school restructuring as a means of increasing the attractiveness as well as the effectiveness of schools.

Eighteen elementary and middle schools have been designated as STAR schools ("schools that are restructuring"), and have received extensive technical

assistance as well as benefiting from a **funding process designed to encourage cross-program team-work.** The Boston/Chelsea Team and School Department have:

* developed a series of **models of restructuring and program integration** to guide planning;

* organized a **professional development** series on integrated planning for STAR principals;

* provided **on-site assistance on school improvement planning** to each STAR school;

* developed a process for **three-year school improvement plans integrating funds and programs** (appendix);

* organized a **technical assistance/planning** day in August with expert assistance in relation to each of the restructuring models and a principal-led session in September on the **nuts-and-bolts of school change**; and

* supported **networking** among STAR staff and with the Early Learning Centers.

This emphasis upon working with the staff of selected schools, with a strong emphasis on **cross-program collaboration** for improvement of instruction and support, was based upon a conviction that this would produce more positive results than funding discrete projects or monitoring for program compliance.

The STAR school strategy offers **incentives and scope for fundamental changes in how schools operate**, as suggested by effective schools research: "High and low performance schools appear to be distinguished more by their leadership, professionalism, and teamwork . . . than by their graduation requirements, or homework and writing requirements."[1]

Zone superintendents are in the process of selecting a second group of STAR schools, based upon need (as indicated by parent choices) and readiness for change. The effort must now be linked to Poston's new policy of School-Based Management/ Shared Decision-Making as well as to recent bold (and very welcome) proposals for decentralization of the budget process.

> "At least two additional two-way bilingual schools (like the Hernandez) and at least two additional integrated special/ regular education schools (like the O'Hearn) will be developed in time for applications in 1990."

Eight additional schools are at some stage in the process of providing a two-way bilingual program, and several are working on integration of special and regular education. The school selection process offered these as options for the first time this year.

Expansion of the two-way bilingual model is a concrete application of the policy on the education of linguistic minority pupils adopted last year by the Board, and grows out of a statewide effort by the Office of Educational Equity to help desegregated schools with bilingual programs to become truly integrated.

Implementation difficulties, having to do with assignments and staffing, have plagued this effort, and the Bilingual Advisory Council is working on policy and operational recommendations for the Superintendent.

> "(6) In cooperation with the four zone superintendents, strengthen parent information centers and school-level outreach to parents. Arrange training for all PIC staff in counselling parents about school choices and in the mechanics of the assignment process for 1990. Develop effective mechanisms to link school-level improvements with the parent information system. Assist the PICs in becoming resource centers for school-level outreach to parents."

Boston's parent information centers are considerably more effective than a year ago, but (except in the high school zone) are not yet linked strongly enough to the assignment process. Far more should be done to reach out to prospective kindergarteners during the year before their enrollment to minimize the confusion around Labor Day and to carry out language proficiency screening as well as individual counselling of parents.

We met recently (as noted above) with Superintendent McDonough and the zone superintendents to press for a clear assumption of responsibility, by the latter, for parent outreach and counselling related to assignments.

Some schools have been vigorous and effective in telling their story to parents who are making a choice, while others have still not accepted the need to do so.

The Team is seeking to strengthen outreach to parents by linking Chapter 1, early childhood, comprehensive health and adult education funding and services to the parent information centers.

> "(7) In cooperation with the Bilingual Department and the four zone superintendents, assist at least six schools to develop plans for improved integration of bilingual and regular education, including training for all staff in language development and integration techniques."

See above (#5). Magnet school funds will support a planning and training process at eight schools committed to the two-way model. In addition, four STAR schools have selected integration of bilingual and regular education as their restructuring model. As with so much else, the budget crisis and staffing uncertainties have made it very difficult to move ahead, despite the strong commitment of Boston's bilingual director.

As noted above, the Bilingual Advisory Council has been asked, by Superintendent McDonough, to develop recommendations for removing these obstacles to effective implementation of integrated bilingual education.

> "(8) Operate a complaint management system, in English and Spanish, to identify issues in all program areas. Establish, with the superintendent, a process for regular consultation and problem-solving."

Thanks to the experience and energy of the Team's only professional with GBREC experience, the complaint management system is functioning well. A number of complaints have been investigated and resolved within the context of the Team's collaboration with the school system, and have thus not required enforcement action.

We have been pleased with the prompt attention, by the Superintendent and the Department of Implementation, to issues about assignment of homeless children.

> "(9) [Allen v. McDonough monitoring and other special education issues not included above -- to be determined this week in discussion with Mary Beth Fafard]"

The decision was made, last Winter, that special education compliance would be handled by the Division of Special Education, with the Team working on school-level program development (see above #5).

CHELSEA

Superintendent Diana Lam and the Boston University staff working with Chelsea have set such an energetic pace for reform that our role has been primarily to lend support and to cut through state procedures that might slow them down. Through the Boston/Chelsea Advisory Committee and the complaint management system, we have also raised issues and sought corrective action in a few cases.

The objectives set a year ago (see indented passages below) do not capture the emerging change of course by the Chelsea Public Schools. In particular, we have welcomed the strong stress upon teaching in virtually every action taken this past year. This comes across clearly in the plan for new facilities, which calls for three k-8 "learning centers" housing several schools apiece, each school headed by a "principal teacher" who would spend 40% of her/his time teaching and the balance giving instructional leadership.

"(1) Assist the Shurtleff school to develop into a model of program (Chapter 1, bilingual, SPED) integration."

The Shurtleff continues to develop its model of program integration, begun as a magnet school planning project with heavy involvement of GBREC staff three years ago. Professor Maria Brisk of Boston University is offering a course for teachers on site. A Shurtleff team participates in all STAR school activities, and is developing a magnet theme.

"(2) Assist the Williams school to develop a magnet theme."

The Team has worked with the Williams--both elementary and intermediate levels--to become a STAR school and a successful magnet under the new assignment plan. The middle school has been clustered, and a new integrated bilingual program is starting as a continuation of that at the Shurtleff.

"(3) Assist the superintendent in preparing to implement a controlled choice assignment plan."

Centralized registration and assignments on the basis of controlled choice were implemented for kindergarten, and will be used for all new entrants to the system.

"(4) Assist the superintendent in setting up a parent information and pupil registration center."

Chelsea's parent information center has opened and registers all new entrants to the system. The center will be strengthened and broadened in its mission by linkage to Early Childhood and Chapter 1 resources and programs.

"(5) Assist Chelsea High in developing and implementing a drop-out prevention strategy."

Chelsea High has gone through major (and difficult) changes over the past year. Movement of all 8th graders into the high school, for space reasons, caused problems until clusters were set up to provide continuity of teaching and support.

With its new organization into distinctive houses (a "traditional school," a "Renaissance school," and an "alternative school") and its dynamic new principal, as well as an innovative program to enable students to make up failed courses (490 failed two or more last Fall!), Chelsea High could become a model of urban education. The Team has provided support in the development of essential skills and dropout prevention efforts.

"(6) Assist the superintendent in completing a facilities plan."

From a desegregation perspective, Chelsea's controlled choice assignment plan should assure that any configuration of facilities supports racial integration. The Team is working with the system to assure that planning and construction of greatly-needed facilities can move forward without any hitches.

"(7) Cooperate with Boston University in providing technical assistance and other resources to the school system."

Regular coordinating meetings have now been established, and a representative of Boston University participated in the first. We will continue to explore how we can collaborate effectively.

"(8) Provide support and information to the oversight panel as requested."

Although representatives of the Boston/Chelsea Team have attended the meetings of the oversight panel, they have not been asked for information.

NEW INITIATIVES

The Team is undertaking the following new initiatives in Boston and Chelsea:

1. [BOSTON] developing a comprehensive set of proposed modifications to Boston's student assignment plan, with extensive input from parent organizations and individuals;

2. [BOSTON/CHELSEA] identifying and planning with "cycle 2" STAR schools that are committed to fundamental change in the interest of effective education and increased attractiveness to parents;

3. [BOSTON] relating the STAR school effort to School-based Management under Boston's professional contracts and to budget decentralization;

4. [BOSTON/CHELSEA] working with schools eligible to implement school-wide Chapter 1 projects to encourage them to move away from pull-out approaches in the interest of effective program integration;

5. [BOSTON/CHELSEA] working with the Chapter 1 parent outreach and training component to link it effectively with the five state-funded Parent Information Centers and with new early childhood and adult education initiatives;

6. [BOSTON] collaborating with the Divisions of Educational Personnel and School Programs on the implementation of the Carnegie-funded middle school project, Turning Points, in two Boston schools;

7. [BOSTON/CHELSEA] encouraging networking and sharing of staff development and other resources between the two systems and their university and business partners; and

8. [BOSTON/CHELSEA] working with both systems to use the development of three-year plans for bilingual education as a vehicle for fundamental decisions about program improvement and integration.

9. [BOSTON] relating the STAR school and high school restructuring efforts to the pilot competency-based assessment of pupil achievement sponsored by the Private Industry Council.

REFORMING URBAN EDUCATION

The comments that follow apply only to Boston, in deference to the Chelsea Oversight Panel's forthcoming report on the Boston University/Chelsea partnership.

In a study of external efforts to reform the San Francisco Public Schools, Doris Fine concluded that "the prospects for reforming any institution are profoundly dependent upon that institution's own capacities and commitments. In complex organizations, nothing gets done by simple command; change requires administrative action that is sustained and reaches in depth to all those whose concerted efforts must be enlisted."[2]

Our experience over the past nine months amply confirms this conclusion. Time and again promising developments have been frustrated because they did not enjoy support at all levels of the organization.

Initiatives from individual schools, or from zone offices, or from units at the central office, or from the School Committee itself fail to produce results because the other levels of the system have exercised the silent veto of inaction.

Over the past year, for example, the School Committee voted to increase the number of two-way bilingual

schools and to adopt a program to reduce the number of Hispanic drop-outs. A group of school department and external advisers developed a very promising strategy for competency-based education at the secondary level. A large federal grant was obtained to develop distinctive magnet themes at each of the high schools, and extensive planning went into the development of an arts-related high school. State and central office representatives agreed upon a fundamental re-orientation of Chapter 1 compensatory education funding (over $20 million) to stress overall school improvement rather than pull-out programs. A state-of-the-art student assignment plan, linked explicitly with school improvement, was implemented. School-based management was incorporated into a new teachers' contract that received national attention.

Each of these efforts--and it would be easy to multiply examples--should already be well-advanced, but in fact all are limping along. The prolonged agony of the Allen (special education) Case and the on-going frustration over bilingual and occupational education are only the most visible examples of a system "in irons," half-way to reform and unable to move forward.

This semi-paralysis is not for lack of good people. We have developed a deep respect for Superintendent McDonough and for many of his associates at all levels. Our collaboration with them has been close and fruitful in many ways, and we are confident of their commitment to reform. The system, we firmly believe, is in better shape this September--apart from its budget troubles--than it has been for many years. But this is obviously not enough.

More fundamental change is needed, change in the very environment in which schools must operate. That environment must become one that supports and indeed impells a new style of functioning in the daily business of school life.[3]

The controlled choice assignment plan and the commitment to decentralization could offer such a framework, but only if their logic is implemented with radical thoroughness. Half-way measures will not succeed.

A recent article in the Boston Globe reports that the Minister for Reform in Romania has concluded that a "mixed system" with elements of a centralized and of a market economy "is impossible to create."[4]

Similarly, we cannot set up a system of parent choice and ask school people to begin to behave in boldly innovative ways, while continuing to insist upon maintaining all the state and central-office controls.

This is not to say that there is not a continuing role for the state and for the school system. Children are not a commodity that can be left to the vagaries of the market.

The fundamental responsibilities of the school system and the state, it sems to us, are

1. to assure that the overall system functions in a way that is fair to all pupils, with particular sensitivity to those with special needs, to those whose first language is not English, and to those who might be discriminated against or denied opportunities because of prejudice or stereotypes; and

2. to set the common goals that each school, however it may differ in its approach, will be committed to meeting for its pupils (while being encouraged to set other goals that are unique to the school).

The funding process, the enforcement of laws and regulations, the technical assistance and training offered to schools should seek in every way to support school-level efforts to educate in the best way that they -- with the support of parents -- know how, consistent with these two broad concerns.

The corollary of this is that school staff who do not respond to the three-fold challenge of fairness, meeting common goals, and satisfying parents should not be protected from the results of their incompetence or indifference. "Blaming the system" should, in a system that has been radically reformed, be no more acceptable as an excuse than "blaming the child."

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT

That it has been possible, despite limited staffing, to achieve solid results is an indication of the value of concentrating on a few, high-payoff strategies that build upon energies already present in the system: parent choice of schools, commitment to decentralization, focus on new and more effective approaches to teaching, concern about educational practices and structures that lead to failure for too many students.

One of my responsibilities for the past twenty years has been to work with regional education centers to increase their capacity to respond to the needs of urban education. I have found that the time and energy of Department staff tend to be absorbed by competing demands of routine and periodic crisis, leaving little scope for following high-payoff strategies of fundamental change. "Urban teams" have quickly turned into a structure for sharing information across programmatic lines, and perhaps for coordinating monitoring efforts, and little more. While maintenance of appropriate routines is necessary, and crises must be responded to, it is hard to see how doing either can result in the reform of education.

The Boston/Chelsea Team has sought to limit its absorption in either routine or crisis. Given limited staff, it would in any case have been necessary to employ a sort of triage among possible activities, but an even more important consideration was to maintain clarity of focus and avoid being drawn into reinforcing pathology.

Bilingual education provides a good example. Prior to establishment of the Boston/Chelsea Team, staff of the TBE Bureau worked full-time in routine and crisis activities related to the bilingual program in Boston. Routine activities included visiting every program to inspect student records, staffing ratios, curriculum, materials, and staff certification. Crisis activities included attempting to intervene (generally without much success) in such situations as the dispersion of Haitian and Cape Verdean high school programs when schools were closed in August 1989.

Although the Boston/Chelsea Team has not been assigned bilingual staff--and has avoided engaging in either routine or crisis activities related to bilingual education in Boston--our overall strategy promises to produce solid improvements in the educational experience of linguistic minority pupils. Working closely with Boston Director Nydia Mendez, we have emphasized

(a) developing a plan for fundamental reorganization of secondary education for linguistic minority students,

(b) developing policies and staffing and assignment procedures that will support two-way and integrated bilingual schools, and

(c) encouraging and helping individual schools to pilot new approaches to integration as an aspect of educational effectiveness.

Each of these initiatives is now a priority of the Superintendent and School Committee; each is tied to strategies of the Boston/Chelsea Team that are not limited to bilingual education. And this is the critical point: **bilingual education in Boston (and Chelsea) is no longer being treated as an isolated and thus isolating program that can be "fixed" by itself. Providing instruction and support through home languages is being treated as an essential aspect of an integrated strategy for effective education.**

This is not to suggest that compliance with the transitional bilingual education law and regulations is not of continuing concern to the Boston/Chelsea Team, nor that we are willing to ignore the crises that periodically arise, but that **we are not willing to be deflected from a strategy that promises to bring fundamental change.**

The complaint system and our close working relationship with the school departments as well as with the parent advisory committees provide a means of identifying and resolving compliance issues. The distinctiveness of our approach is that these issues are not allowed to

dominate or to divert us from a focus upon effective education of linguistic minority pupils.

Four years ago I recommended a new strategy for urban school reform. The Commissioner would select two or three cities each year and designate a representative to negotiate a "comprehensive equity plan" with each. Developing such plans would require putting aside "business-as-usual" to **focus on fundamental changes in a few critical areas**, and would emerge from an intense collaboration between state and local staff, with significant involvement of parent and advocacy groups.

This **cooperative, problem-solving model of education reform**, rather than seeking to provide a miniature regional center, is what the Boston/Chelsea Team has been all about.

We have found this model of state action as effective as it is resource-efficient.

****

1. John E. Chubb and Terry M. Moe, Politics, Markets, and America's Schools, Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1990, 99.

2. Doris Fine, "Just Schools," in School Days, Rule Days: The Legalization and Regulation of Education, edited by David L. Kirp and Donald N. Jensen, Philadelphia: Falmer Press, 1986.

3. Charles L. Glenn, "Perestroika for American Education," in Rethinking Effective Schools, edited by William Firestone and Craig Richards, Prentice-Hall, 1990.

4. "Key Romanian lauds free-market system," The Boston Globe, September 20, 1990.

Office of Educational Equity
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169-5183

10/6/90

TO: Superintendent McDonough

FROM: Charles Glenn

RE: **Recommended Modifications to Assignment Process**

On June 27th of this year we sent the attached memo to over 300 individuals concerned with the Boston Public Schools, inviting them to advise us of their suggestions for modifications in the student assignment plan. In preparing the recommendations that follow, we have drawn upon written suggestions provided by a number of individuals and groups, as well as our own experience and analysis in monitoring the assignment process. The suggestions made by Parent Information Center staff were especially helpful.

Management

Many problems have arisen this year (and last) because of lack of clarity about where responsibility resides for key elements of the student assignment process. This was one of the issues discussed last Spring, and your letter of April 23rd to Chairman Crain identified as of critical importance "whether zone superintendents, zone planning councils and individual building administrators have been given the decision-making power necessary to make the controlled choice plan successful." **We have concluded that they have not.**

Having followed all aspects of the implementation process closely over the past eighteen months, and discussed solutions with many individuals, we recommend the following:

The **Department of Implementation** should continue to exercise "central authority over assignments

and transportation arrangements,"[1] but the zone superintendents should be responsible, under guidelines developed by the DI, for efficient and effective management of the assignment and transportation process, including the operational supervision of DI staff assigned to each zone for that purpose.[2]

The DI can best carry out its mission, in a system as large and complex as Boston's, by concentrating on policy-setting and monitoring:

(a) establishing general rules and procedures for the assignment process;

(b) setting desegregation assignment targets for each grade level in each zone, based upon projected enrollment for that grade level including pupils requiring bilingual education services[3] and not an average of grades k-8;

(c) managing the appeals process;

(d) monitoring compliance with desegregation mandates and preparing regular public reports on the outcomes of the assignment process; and

---

[1] 5/31/90 Final Judgment.

[2] "[T]hese Zone Superintendents would be held responsible for the overall implementation of the new Student Assignment Plan within their respective zones" (2/27/89 Plan, page 38).

[3] The 2/27/89 Plan was modified by the School Committee on 4/4/89, against the recommendation of the State, to exclude bilingual program pupils in setting "ideal racial percentages" for each zone; we recommend that the Committee revisit this decision, for reasons stated in the section below on bilingual program assignments.

(e) performing centrally tasks, such as transportation contracting, which cannot be decentralized.

The assignment process could be carried out more efficiently and linked more effectively to the parent information and school improvement efforts that (according to the Plan) are essential to full success if zone superintendents are responsible for:

(e) determining location of all bilingual, special education, and other programs for which space must be set aside, in consultation with central office directors and school administrators;

(f) setting assignable capacities for each grade and program of each school,[4] reflecting desegregation targets set by the DI and reserving space in regular classes for mainstreaming in schools with bilingual programs;[5] these capacities should in the aggregate not exceed the number of projected assignable pupils for each grade and program in the zone;

(g) establishing a timetable for applications and assignments to all schools in the

---

[4] "Zone Superintendents must certify instructional capacities for each elementary and middle school in their respective zones. An instructional capacity must be set for each school and for each grade-level within each school. The instructional capacity will represent a school's assignable capacity for the following school year" (2/27/89 Plan, page 45).

[5] "[T]he allocation of instructional space within each school will include space sufficient to accommodate mainstreaming bilingual and special needs students when educationally appropriate during the school year" (2/27/89 Plan, page 23).

zone, with an emphasis on making the bulk of assignments as early as possible[6];

(h) supervising a zone parent information center (with satelite centers possible) with responsibility for

(i) preparation and dissemination of parent information, with cooperation among the zones to assure that comparable information is available from all schools at the same grade level;

(ii) counselling parents and students about the options available in each school, encouraging desegregative assignment requests;

(iii) screening to determine the need for bilingual and special education services;

(iv) making school and transportation assignments;

(v) processing transfer requests; and

(vi) conducting follow-up surveys to determine how well the process worked for parents.

Staff of the DI and other units of the school system should be assigned full-time to the zone offices to work under the supervision of the zone superintendents;[7]

---

[6] "This early assignment procedure will also make the entire student assignment process more manageable and will enable students to obtain their actual assignments long before they begin the next school year" (2/27/89 Plan, page 47).

[7] 2/27/89 Plan, page 40.

(i) deciding to increase capacity (if possible) at schools with an excess of applications permitting desegregated voluntary assignments, and to decrease capacity at schools that have received an insufficient number of such applications;

(j) through parent information center(s), providing a wide range of services to encourage parents to be effective participants in the education of their children, including adult education, early childhood and Chapter 1 parent involvement efforts.

These organiizational recommendations are consistent with the 2/27/89 Plan adopted by the School Committee, which provided that "Each [parent information and student assignment] center will have a Student Assignment Officer who will be solely responsible for making all final assignment decisions and who will report to the Zone Superintendent. The Department of Implementation will retain its oversight authority for certifying all student assignments. Each center will have a director[8] and parent coordinators who will be responsible for administering the school selection and student registration process" (page 22).

It was understandable that Fall 1989 assignments were carried out with a certain amount of confusion and imperfectly-decentralized arrangements, but this should not have been the case for Fall 1990 assignments. The insistence by the DI on keeping the assignment process centralized--requiring Student Assignment Officers to do the bulk of their work at Court Street--meant that the 1990 process was little improved over that in 1989.

Help was available. The State provided over $800,000 for the operation of PICs, and met frequently with School Department officials to stress the importance of a well-organized process. Each month the desegregation coordinators of fifteen Massachusetts cities meet to share what they are learning about effective adminis-

---

[8] given Boston's job titles, "manager" or "coordinator" might be more appropriate.

tration of choice-based assignments; the only Boston representation has been from the High School Zone PIC.

Assignment Process

As noted above, we are recommending that each zone be given considerable autonomy in establishing an assignment process, within general guidelines established by the DI for the sake of fairness and desegregation compliance.

Last year, we urged strongly that the assignment process be simplified and made more user-friendly in several ways:

(1) Distribute application forms only to parents of pupils in the transitional grades; notify other parents by letter of the process (through their parent information center) for seeking a transfer. Last Spring the application forms were not available at PICs on the first day of applications; this caused massive confusion and frustration and must not happen again.

(2) Carry out the assignment process for middle and elementary schools at different times, to allow PIC staff to focus their outreach and counselling in a more rational way. For example, the middle school process could be as early as January, on the assumption that most pupils assigned to sixth grade for September will have been in fifth grade the previous year. The first grade process could be in March, and kindergarten in May and continuing through the summer (together with new-to-Boston pupils on an on-going basis). The promise of the 2/27/89 plan, that "[t]he actual school selection and assignment process will operate on an early and timely basis with a specific and predictable schedule of assignments" (page 20), has not been kept.

(3) The process should not be held hostage to the promotion practices of each school. Pupils retained in sixth grade (for example) should not affect the number of new pupils assigned to that school for sixth grade, nor should new seventh graders to assigned to the school to take their place. It should be up to the school to make arrangements to serve these pupils on an ungraded basis.

(4) A concerted effort, including individual parent contacts, should be made by each school to determine which pupils (especially those in k2) will not be returning the following year so that this space can be assigned to new or transferring pupils early.

(5) Placement on a waiting list should <u>not</u> be automatic. The Plan adopted on 2/27/90 is ambivalent on this point: "Students who do not receive their first or second choice may, if they wish, request to be placed on a waiting list for their preferred schools" (page 20), but "Students who do not obtain their first choice school will be automatically placed on a waiting list for their first choice school" (pages 23-4). The automatic waiting list system has created major problems and delays. Parents should be informed of the <u>opportunity</u> to have their children placed on waiting lists for up to three schools, and they should be informed of the number of applicants already on a waiting list and of their own rank on the list.

(6) The DNR list should be cleared much faster by informing parents that if they neither send their child nor notify the school during the first week of classes, their child will be dropped from the school roster and they will have to reapply for an assignment. Nearly 20% of all assigned pupils had not reported to school by September 22, and 15% had not reported by September 28, 1990: these pupils (if indeed they still intend to attend the

BPS this year) should lose their claim on a seat for which another pupil is waiting (874 pupils remained unassigned on September 28).

(7) The three racial/ethnic categories are an unnecessary complication, and the combining of Hispanic and Asian pupils in a single category causes a variety of problems. It would be appropriate to use only two categories, white and minority, as is already the case late in the assignment process.

(8) The method adopted for making high school assignments (proceeding applicant-by-applicant based upon random numbers) has the effect that applicants are not penalized in gaining admission to a particular school because they ranked another school higher; it should be adopted for all grade levels.

(9) "Walk zones" should be overlapping; that is, parents should be able to compete for "50 percent of available instructional places" at any school "within one mile of the school and within one and one-half miles of a middle school,"[9] although actual assignments must continue to be subject to the desegregation goals.

(10) The plan's language about walk-zone set-asides is ambiguous. An example: the Murphy's capacity for first grade was 56, of whom 12 were to be white. Should the walk-zone preference be applied to only six white applicants, or to twelve (or, after minority applicants have been accommodated, to seventeen, applying the +/- 10 percentage point range), since that would still amount to less than 50% of the "available instructional places" in first grade? Either reading of the plan would be consistent with desegregation and we do not have a preference. The former keeps open access for

---

[9] 2/27/89 Plan, page 54.

pupils living at a distance, while the latter could reduce transportation costs and satisfy a few more "neighborhood" applicants.

(11) "Walk zone preference should be employed for every choice, not just first choice, and for every round of assignments."[10]

(12) "Assignments and transportation should be set up by July 31st so that people have AT LEAST ONE MONTH to make any adjustments in work/pickup/drop off schedules."[11]

(13) The delays, this summer, in processing applications at the DI had the effect that it did not become possible for PICs to provide accurate information about seats available or to make walk-in assignments, both of which are essential to dealing fairly with parents new to the system. The computer network set up last year, though it may need modifications based upon experience, would permit a much quicker and simpler process.

(14) "Sibling preference should be respected for every choice, not just first choice, and for every round of assignments."[12]

Kindergarten

(1) All kindergarten registration, without exception, should be carried out by trained parent information center staff who are able to counsel parents accurately about the

---

[10] recommendation by Ellen Guiney of the Mayor's Office, which we support.

[11] Parent Information Center Staff recommendation, which we support.

[12] recommendation by Ellen Guiney of the Mayor's Office, which we support.

process and the options available. Staff of a school cannot be expected to describe the options in an even-handed way. This policy, which was strongly urged by the Controlled Choice unit as well as by us last Spring, would reduce substantially the number of pupils assigned involuntarily or left unassigned.

(2) Each school should have a number of permanent kindergarten seats equal to its number of first grade seats and allocated racially on the same desegregative basis. Reservation of 20% of the seats as "temporary" (as this year) because of an expectation that that high a proportion of first graders will not be promoted simply reinforces a bad educational practice; see discussion of retention above.

(3) In the school selection process, the confusing alternative of permanent and temporary seats should not be offered; experience shows that few parents select temporary seats, even if they do not intend to remain with the public schools. Instead, as the PIC staff have recommended, kindergarten applicants should be given a temporary seat only if they cannot be granted one of their requested [permanent] seats.

(4) Elementary schools that continue to have difficulty attracting a desegregated enrollment on a voluntary basis should be given the option of an extended day kindergarten class.

(5) Consideration should be given to assigning children for the whole year to either morning or afternoon sessions, after allowing parents to indicate a preference. As CWEC has pointed out, "there is NO support for continuing the annual reversal" of sessions.

(6) Consideration should be given to allowing parents to indicate that they will not accept

a half-day kindergarten assignment so that, if the children of these parents are not assigned to one of the full-day kindergartens for which they apply, they will remain unassigned rather than taking a seat that they do not intend to use.

(7) Pupils in temporary k1 or k2 seats should be given preference for permanent k1, k2 or first grade seats in the same school over a new applicant.

(8) Outreach for prospective kindergarteners should be carried out over the course of the previous school year, through identifying children who will be of the appropriate age and contacting their parents individually. Other cities implementing controlled choice have obtained excellent cooperation from Housing, Welfare, and Health officials in this process, and have made a particular effort to assure that minority parents are reached effectively. Boston's under-representation of minority children in K1 and K2 is partly attributable to Head Start, but far too many children are receiving no pre-school experience through a failure to reach their parents.

(9) Effective early outreach would make it possible to carry out language proficiency screening before assignments are made; it is not appropriate to make educational decisions on the basis of home language surveys alone.

Advanced Work Classes

Selection and assignment of pupils for advanced work, based on an assessment made in the third grade, should be abolished.

Each elementary and middle school should provide opportunities for advanced work for all pupils who would benefit, on a part-time basis. There

should be no separate process or quotas for AWC assignments. Appropriately-trained staff should be assigned to each school to work with classroom teachers in planning and implementing opportunities for advanced work and enrichment.

School staff should be encouraged to develop alternative approaches to advanced work and enrichment as a basis for parent choice.

Bilingual Assignments

(1) Each zone superintendent should (in consultation with the Director of Bilingual Education, the Master PAC, the Zone Improvement Council, and the principals/headmasters) develop a plan for the provision of bilingual instruction and support in as many schools as possible in the zone.[13] This instruction and support should be available to linguistic minority pupils who would benefit from them although not enrolled in transitional bilingual education.

One of the goals of these plans should be to make as many schools as possible accessible for limited-English-speaking pupils, without compromising the quality of instruction and services provided. Pupils who speak Spanish, in particular, should be able to select the majority of schools in the system with assurance that services will be available.

---

[13] "By requiring each . . . zone to plan a comprehensive education for all students living therein, Controlled Choice plans for advanced students as well as those with limitations. . . we urge the Boston Public Schools to allocate seats within zone schools for bilingual and special education students in a way that will permit such students to receive a mainstream education within the same school building" (2/27/89 Plan, page 17).

(2) By including pupils requiring bilingual services in the zone-wide enrollments on the basis of which desegregation goals are set, and in the desegregative allocation of seats in each school (see above), two problems evident this year will be avoided:

(a) pupils mainstreamed from bilingual to regular education will not affect the desegregation compliance of a school (since they will already be counted in that compliance), and thus will be assured of remaining in the same school without re-entering the assignment process;[14] and

(b) no school will be assigned such a high proportion of pupils from a single linguistic minority group that effective educatiional integration becomes difficult or impossible, as occurred this year at several.

(2) The pupil/teacher ratio for two-way bilingual programs for all pupils (whether LEP or English-dominant) should be based upon the state regulations for bilingual education.

(3) The pupil/teacher ratio for regular education classes in schools with bilingual programs should not exceed 25:1 to permit the integration activities mandated by law, and as vacancies become available in such classes they should not be filled from outside the school until it has been determined that they will not be needed for pupils being mainstreamed within the school.

(4) Assignment of new pupils to a two-way bilingual program or school for third grade or above should be subject to a determination of appropriate proficiency in both languages used for instruction.

(5) Each principal of a school accommodating a bilingual program should be responsible for the

---

[14] contra the 2/27/89 Plan, page 52.

integration of pupils, teachers and learning objectives.

Additional recommendations will undoubtedly emerge from the newly-formed Bilingual Advisory Council, which has agreed to discuss assignment and staffing policies affecting integrated bilingual schools at its November meeting.

Examination Schools

Provision should be made for admission of qualified pupils to examination schools at other than the seventh and ninth grade, as space becomes available.

We understand that the Secondary Plan will deal in some detail with (1) a process for changing the criteria for admission to examination schools, (2) the place of these schools within the overall provision of educational opportunities in Boston, (3) support for linguistic minority and LD pupils within the examination schools, and (4) the grades offered by all three examination schools.

Inter-zone Assignments

Each zone superintendent should (in consultation with principals) determine, before the parent information and assignment process begins each year, which schools in the zone will accept pupils from other zones, by number, race and grade. This provision should apply to schools that have already been designated as "city-wide" as well as to other schools that have been cut off, by the zone lines, from the residential areas from which they have drawn pupils in the past.

Proposals for inter-zone assignments should be reviewed each year by the DI to assure that the net effect of seats made available will not have a segregative effect in any zone.

Office of Educational Equity
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169-5183

June 27th 1990

TO: Interested Parties

FROM: Charles Glenn, Executive Director

RE: **Modifications to Boston Student Assignment Plan**

The Board of Education has on-going responsibility to assure that Massachusetts school systems meet their desegregation obligations under state and federal law. It has long been the position of the Board that desegregation plans must be equitable, stable, and effective, and the Board has been especially favorable toward plans that are tied to school improvement, parent involvement, and expanded choice.

While the assignment plan implemented at all grade levels this year in Boston is, in the Board's view, fundamentally sound, there are a number of ways in which it could be strengthened. The Office of Educational Equity expects to recommend to the Boston School Committee and the State Board, in the Fall, a number of modifications that, if adopted, would take effect for 1991 assignments.

Your suggestions for modification of the assignment plan would help us to assure that all critical issues are addressed. The sooner we have these suggestions, the more opportunity there will be to discuss them thoroughly, but we will accept suggestions if received by September 20th.

Issues that have already been raised include:

* kindergarten -- "permanent" and "temporary"
* the racial/ethnic categories used for assignments
* notification and counseling of parents who do not receive a selected school
* size, grades, and admission to advanced work classes and exam schools
* waiting lists and transfers
* bilingual program locations and assignments

There are undoubtedly many others.

If you would like a copy of our report Controlled Choice in Boston: The First Year please write, or call 770-7530. The report ~~serves~~ provides background on many of these issues -- while making clear that, in general, we consider the plan and its initial implementation a very positive development.

THE PURPOSES OF THE RESTRUCTURING PROJECT

The purpose of the STAR schools project is to pilot ways to improve the quality of schooling for all students and their families. The schools that were selected for participation by the state and the superintendents are those schools that seemed most in need of change in order to attract students in sufficient number and racial diversity. While it is expected that the schools themselves will define the nature and extent of change through an extensive school-based planning process, both the state and the school system have concrete ideas about the goals for change and about the direction change should take.

First, the basic building blocks of the school must be the target of change. Over the three year span of the project, **STAR schools are expected to make fundamental changes in their organization, governance, policies,attitudes, programs and practices.** These changes are expected to be directed toward making sure that every adult in the school believes that every student can learn and making sure that every student does in fact learn the curriculum and self respect.

Second, **change must be systemic** rather than piecemeal. Even though a school may be concentrating on a particular type of change program, such as two-way bilingual or family literacy, the school must also consider and make the kinds of changes in governance, organization and instructional methodology that will support their primary change effort.

Third, **change must be directed toward creating communities of learners and teachers who are not labeled , divided and instructed according to a deficit model of learning.** This means changing pull-out programs and other tracking practices and making sure that content,materials and methodology bring high expectations right into every classroom and every lesson immediately and constantly.

Fourth, change must be directed toward **expanding the numbers and roles of adults** who are involved in making decisions in the school and who are part of making things happen in the school. Parents, particularly, need to be included in greater numbers but so must cultural, social agency, business, college and community based agency representatives.

Finally, a common element in all restructuring schools must be an **enriched curriculum and diversified pedagogy.** Schools must reach out for materials and programs that will build at all grade levels a world-centered curriculum. Geography, art and literature lend themselves readily to an expansion of the curriculum which will allow every child to see herself or himself as a person with a definite and positive place in the past, the present and the future. Schools must develop a teaching staff that is versatile enough to respond appropriately to students with a variety of learning styles and preferences.

SOME OF THE ELEMENTS OF RESTRUCTURING

Systemic changes

1. Give the adults in the building accurate and full information concerning the management of the school and foster broad participation in matters affecting the school.

2. Review and revise school policies in such areas as academic punishment, suspension for minor infractions, ability grouping and retention in grade.

3. Review and revise the organization and schedule for instruction. Consider changes such as smaller learning units; team teaching, planning and support; flexible scheduling; cooperative learning; accelerated learning; cross grade grouping and teacher assignment; interdisciplinary curriculum; and common planning time.

Communities of learners who are not labeled

4. Integrate students so no grades or classrooms or activities are limited or organized by primary language, race, sex, achievement level, or special need;

> If the school houses a bilingual program, ensure the development of parallel curriculum content and sequence, scheduling of classes compatible with mainstream activities, mutual planning time for teachers, and consciousness raising on cultural issues.
>
> If the school houses a special needs program, ensure that new models for integrating special and regular students are attempted and that regular and special needs teachers are given many opportunities to learn about and interact with both groups of students.
>
> Review all pull-out programs including Chapter 1 in light of their divisive nature and develop alternatives that do not label and separate students.

5. Create a climate in the school that accepts and values diversity and sets explicit, high expectations for the learning of all students and the work of all adults.

Expanded participation and roles for parents

6. Create and sustain a bond between the school and the families of all the students. Think which students might be attracted to the school and develop an operative recruitment strategy. Collaborate on an on-going basis with the parent information centers to recruit students and inform parents.

7. Train parents to be productive participants in the education of their children and effective advocates for improving schooling for their own and other children.

An enriched curriculum and diversified pedagogy

8. Working with teachers and parents, develop a distinctive instructional strategy or magnet theme. Welcome the community to your building.

9. Invest in the human resources in the school: provide courses for teachers and parents together and separately; arrange motivating activities; create formal mechanisms for recognizing accomplishment; reward successful effort;

10. Support different learning styles through a variety of means such as as different settings; computer assisted instruction; visiting teachers, writers and artists; inquiry method; hands-on experience; and peer teaching.

Restructuring, an over-used word, means different things to different people. It is expected that STAR school participants will be adding to the list of elements of restructuring. Your ideas are welcome.

STAR School Technical Assistance Workshop

The STAR Schools Technical Assistance Workshop planned jointly by Boston Public Schools staff and the Boston/Chelsea Urban Team to help principals and their planning teams to begin writing three year school improvement plans was presented on September 26, 1990. The workshop was a clear indication that the STAR School principals have developed into a strong and viable support group for on-going sharing and networking. "How do I convene a meeting of my planning committee when our collective bargaining agreement limits my teachers to 15 minutes before and 15 minutes after school?" asked one principal. As other principals told of the strategies they have developed -- staggering hours in order to combine two 15-minute segments into a half-hour meeting, moving half-hour weekly in-service meetings to bi-weelky hour meetings, and other subtle and supportive ideas to include more teachers in planning for restructuring, the group busily took notes. Interest was intense, not only on the part of principals, but with school department central officials and state urban team staff as well.

STAR School principals presented orally samples of how they will address the seven sections of the plan. One principal described how his school intends to deal with the section on the Extent of the Need for the Project, describing his school's plan to establish an extended day kindergarten and to integrate special education and regular classes. Another principal described how her school will address the section, Meeting the Purposes of the Project. She explained that her school's effort to establish a parent room had been interrupted because of space problems. This was immediately identified by Boston Public Schools central officials as a Department of Implementation issue, thereby, pointing out that the state urban team could intervene. The principal was advised to put her request in writing, and the urban team will work with the Zone superintendent to resolve the issue. A third principal described her school's Plan of Operation. She shared a wealth of strategies for involving teachers and parents in restructuring, identifying resources and overcoming obstacles. Others addressed sections of the plan on Key Personnel, Commitment of Resources, Evaluation and Promise of Success.

Ultimately other issues of "rules" that become obstacles to school improvement and change were raised. Before the meeting ended, a central office official had told the principals that there is a waiver process in place that is rarely used; another central official had committed to exploring within the system of

getting around some of these bottlenecks; and urban team staff were developing a new initiative: to invite union representatives to one of the weekly urban team/Boston Public Schools meetings for an open and frank exploration of rules that get in the way of doing the right thing. In fact the urban team is considering a standing sub-committee which will grapple with these and similar issues on an ongoing basis.

The novel approach of having the participants take a direct and active role as presentors and facilitators of discussion for the workshop proved to be effective. It stimulated lively discussion and information sharing among school-based staff, zone and central staff and state urban team staff. Further, it demonstrates another benefit of the on-going collaboration between Boston Public Schools and urban team staff.

PROTOTYPE SECTION

SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING

SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING

INTRODUCTION

The **SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PROTOTYPES**, a new addition to the Prototype Catalog, represents the new Boston Public Schools/Department of Education (BPS/DOE) collaborative initiatives, and the major focus for Chapter 636, Section 1 funding. For FY91, 18 schools have been selected to develop and implement school restructuring plans. Eventually, all of Boston's schools will have the opportunity to restructure in the context of:

1. school governance and organization;
2. approaches to learning and teaching;
3. amount and kind of counseling and other student support services;
4. relationships between school and parent/community.

The 18 Schools That Are Restructuring will be known as the **STAR*** Schools, and may select prototypes from this catalog section. The **RESTRUCTURING PROTOTYPES**, RST01-RST17, are designed to help schools achieve the goals of restructuring.

ZONE	ELEMENTARY STAR* SCHOOLS	MIDDLE STAR* SCHOOLS
EAST	S. Greenwood, Perry, PA Shaw	Cleveland, Thompson,
WEST	Dickerman, Higginson, Mozart	Lewis, RG Shaw, Wheatley
NORTH	Blackstone, Farragut, Garfield Tobin, Winship, Winthrop	Dearborn

All other schools may select prototypes from this section, but should not expect the additional state support that the **STAR*** Schools will receive.

SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING, according to the Massachusetts Department of Education, is defined as: **"Fundamental changes in traditional school organization, governance, policies, attitudes, programs and practices."** It requires decentralizing authority and decision-making from the zone and central office level to individual schools through school-based management.

The Boston/Chelsea Urban Team of the Department of Education, working jointly with BPS staff, will serve as a resource to school-based staff and parents in the **STAR*** Schools in developing a comprehensive plan for school improvement.

THE GOALS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING ARE TO:

1. improve student achievement and development;
2. enhance school climate;
3. build a professional environment for teaching;
4. strengthen delivery of services to ensure equity for all students;
5. empower all constituencies within the school community;
6. build lasting and meaningful school change by including as many people as possible in the change process.

RST

POSSIBLE STRATEGIES FOR SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING:

* School governance/shared decision making
* Integration of regular education and bilingual education
* Integration of regular education and special education
* Early Learning Center (developmental classroom) within a K-5 school
* Thematic, integrated, interdisciplinary curriculum
* Family Learning Theme
* Cooperative Learning
* Two way Bilingual
* Team teaching
* Clustering
* Extended school day/week/year
* Flexible scheduling within a school day

A school-community team, that includes members of the School Improvement Council, and with support from the zone and central office level, designs and implements a comprehensive planning process. While the process should be tailored to the uniqueness of the situation and skills of the participants, there are a series of activities that need to occur within a specified timetable. It is essential to build support and commitment within the school and the larger community.

STEPS FOR EFFECTIVE SCHOOL PLANNING:

1. form a team representing a cross-section of the school/community (including the School Improvement Council) to assess needs and plan for change;
2. conduct a school-wide needs assessment to identify areas of strength and concern through such approaches as analysis of student-community data, surveys, interviews, and public meetings;
3. articulate a common vision for the future shared by a representative cross-section of the school community. Consider the following issues:
   a. How does our school look in terms of student demographic and other factors?
   b. Broadly expressed, what are our goals for students? Are they being met? What are gaps between where students are and where they should be?
   c. How might we take better responsibility for student outcomes?
   d. How does our school look in terms of staff demographics and capacity?
   e. What type of formal and informal processes are in place to encourage staff to participate in professional development, share information and time with colleagues inside and outside the school?
   f. What approaches are in place to stimulate shared decision-making in curriculum development, instructional methods, staff hiring and selection?
   g. What problems do we anticipate in achieving our common vision?
4. identify alternatives in response to school assessment;
5. select restructuring prototype or develop a new change option;
6. develop action plans that include timelines, implementation activities, persons responsible, and share plans with the entire school community, including students at the secondary level;
7. implement comprehensive school improvement plan;
8. develop an evaluation process to refine plan and assess outcomes of change.

PARTNERSHIPS: A WAY TO ENHANCE SCHOOL PLANNING

PARTNERSHIPS help improve education through involving schools, higher education institutions, cultural organizations, businesses and/or community organizations in working collaboratively to identify the needs of schools and develop programs to address those needs. Schools currently seeking to restructure, or those interested in planning for improvement and/or restructuring, should explore the possibility of establishing partnerships with any or all of the above-mentioned organizations. Each type of pairing partner brings a particular expertise.

HIGHER EDUCATION PARTNERS serve as facilitators, resource developers, or consultants for technical assistance in developing curriculum or writing grants. They also provide access to their facilities and to a pool of student volunteers. College/university partnership staff play a significant role in assisting an individual school with change, restructuring and management issues. Partnership staff meet with principal/headmaster, school planning team, and selected teaching or counseling staff. Working together, the school administration and college partner develop programs with the potential to draw upon other external resources in support of school programs. Resources available from college/university partners include tutors, access to courses, staff development, use of facilities and placement of student teachers.

To develop a **Higher Education Partnership**:

1. Identify a college partner based upon previous college involvement with school, zone or training programs;
2. Meet with college partner to determine compatibility of school needs with institutional capabilities;
3. Determine process for involving college partner in school-based planning.

BUSINESS AND/OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION PARTNERSHIPS seek to improve education through involving schools, businesses, and community organizations in a collaborative effort to relate the school experience to the world of work. Business partnerships expand the educational resources of the school. Through the design and implementation of programmatic responses to critical educational issues in the school, they improve student attendance, achievement, and self-esteem. By demonstrating the commitment to education of community representatives, they improve school staff morale and energy.

Activities vary according to local needs but may include: occupational awareness for students and teachers; skill development for students; curriculum enhancement; mentoring and tutoring programs; professional development for teachers and administrators; dropout prevention programs; special education vocational transition programs; pre-employment training for students; workplace literacy programs; and other approaches that match the needs of the school with the expertise of the businesses and the community service agencies.

Effective partnerships are built on relationships of mutual understanding and trust, and involve the exchange of human resources (expertise, knowledge, experience). While financial support from businesses may develop, it should occur as the result of joint planning and decision making. The most effective and long lasting partnerships are characterized by strong relationships among the partners and close involvement with students and teachers at the school.

To develop a **Business/Community Organization Partnership:**
1. Business and other community partners are identified and invited to join a school-business partnership planning team;
2. The planning team assesses school needs, collective resources, and practical solutions;
3. The planning team becomes familiar, through presentations and visits, with the functioning and programs of other partnerships;
4. Short and long term goals are established for the partnership;
5. Programs are designed and implemented, starting with small projects to increase the likelihood of success;
6. Programs are evaluated and revised or expanded as appropriate;
7. The partnership publicizes its accomplishments and builds on its success with the development of additional or expanded programs.

CULTURAL PARTNERSHIPS can be developed with the many diverse cultural institutions in Boston, including 1) performing and visual arts groups; 2) art, science, and historical museums; 3) cultural education agencies; and 4) ethnic culture organizations. Activities conducted through cultural partnerships usually involve experiential, hands-on, integrated approaches to learning and may take place either in the school or at the cultural facility. Cultural partners can provide curricular planning, resource development and grant-writing as well as direct classroom instruction and professional development. Services may be tailored to involve the entire school, specific grades or a specific target population such as at-risk students, monolingual/bilingual paired classrooms, school-within-a-school magnet programs or parent/teacher groups. Many past cultural partnership programs have especially enhanced cross-cultural understanding and have generated enthusiastic parental participation.

To develop a **Cultural Partnership:**
1. Form a Steering Team, consisting of representative(s) of both school staff and the arts/cultural organization, to plan and oversee the partnership,
2. The Steering Team assesses needs, develops partnership objectives, determines how arts/cultural organization resources will be used, identifies needed school resources;
3. The Steering Team develops a school-wide cultural enrichment plan in which cultural education will be an integral part of the school's curriculum.

It doesn't really cost anything to establish a partnership. Major cost commitments stem from a joint planning and decision making. Some important cost factors to be considered, however, include stipends for coordination and joint planning; transportation and travel costs; materials acquisition, and consultant costs. Schools interested in establishing new partnerships should contact organizations directly, refer to the **Chapter 636 Partners Directory** at the end of this catalog or call upon Zone Chapter 636 Coordinators to suggest potential pairing partners.

SCHOOL BASED PLANNING

PROGRAM SOURCE: Boston Partners in Education, Inc.

COST CONSIDERATIONS

Consultant/facilitator fees; teacher/staff stipends; materials.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Participating schools will receive training and support in the establishment of working school teams and the development of a school based plan. Trainers will work with school teams of administrators and staff addressing models of planning and group problem solving techniques. School planning teams will become more efficient and effective in implementing a planning process and will develop a comprehensive school based plan.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. Administrators who are conversant and comfortable with School Based Planning and their own styles within this model.
2. School Planning Teams who are self-sufficient planners and designers within the School Based Planning Model.
3. Familiarity by all participants with Strategic Planning, Action Planning and Problem Solving models, how they apply to schools, and the roles and responsibilities needed to implement strategic planning process.
4. Team developed school based plan that includes mission statement and action plan.

PROGRAM SEQUENCE

1. Pre-Planning and agreement with administrator about the scope and range of specific needs regarding planning and implementation.
2. Distribution of survey covering: Experience, Needs, Resources, Expectations of participants. This also serves as a pre-project survey for evaluation.
3. Meeting with participants to introduce program and provide an overview of the Strategic Planning Process and the expectations/commitments for this training project.
4. Development of the School Based Planning model through the development of a site based plan starting with a survey of needs and resources for the individual site and development of a mission statement for the group.
5. Development of goals and objectives for 1, 3 and 5 year cycles for this planning group; introduction to action planning and implementation designing.
6. Program design and implementation including time-lines and responsibility charting.
7. Design of evaluation tool for next planning cycle.

STAFF TRAINING

One of the underlying assumptions of this program is that staff and administration will learn the group planning process as they develop their school based plans. Training will be part of the developmental process as questions arise from the building of School Based Plans. By presenting models of planning and then implementing the theory as an actual planning process, staff will understand the requirements of all phases of a Group Planning Process.

PARENT TRAINING

Parents, as part of the planning committees for School Based Planning, will be involved in the process from inception. In addition, awareness programs for Parents will be offered to explain the planning process for the school and offer opportunities for further involvement.

EVALUATION REQUIREMENT

See Evaluation Plan at the end of this Prototype Section.

REORGANIZING SCHOOL GOVERNANCE: BUILDING A DEMOCRATIC SCHOOL COMMUNITY

PROGRAM SOURCE: Department of Education

COST CONSIDERATIONS

Consultant, stipends, materials, substitutes, babysitting costs for parents.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This is a model for developing a structure of shared decision-making among school administrators, teachers, counselors, parents and students as a foundation for restructuring a school to enhance and increase the services it provides. Establishing a democratic and inclusive process for making all decisions in the school from issues regarding scheduling, curriculum, discipline, community outreach, extra-curricular activities, etc. is a prerequisite for restructuring.

According to this school governance model five governance committees will be developed:

1. Steering Committee, chaired by the principal with representation from teaching staff, counseling staff and parents, charged with the major responsibility of setting agendas for all governance committees;
2. Academic Committee, with representation from the teaching and counseling staff, administration and parents, charged with the responsibility of making decisions concerning curriculum;
3. Discipline Committee, with representation from teaching staff, administration, parents, and students in middle and high schools, charged with the responsibility of establishing and enforcing rules for acceptable behavior;
4. Activities Committee, with representation from all segments of the school community, charged with planning and presenting special activities to enhance school climate;
5. Community Relations Committee, chaired by a parent with representation from all segments of the school community and institutional partners, charged with involving parents and the community in the education of students.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. To develop a democratic and inclusive process for making decisions in a school.
2. To give all members of the school community including parents a sense of ownership of the school.
3. To free up the principal from traditional responsibilities to be able to focus more on educational leadership.
4. To provide a solid foundation for restructuring the school's approaches to teaching and learning, providing student support services and community relations.

RST02

PROGRAM SEQUENCE

1. principal receives orientation and training on shared decision-making.
2. staff receives training and orientation on developing a democratic school community.
3. principal and staff receive training in consensus building and conflict resolution.
4. parents receive training on effective school involvement.
5. Steering Committee is established and convened by the principal.
6. Steering Committee establishes and develops the charges for the other four committees. Each committee will be allowed to accept/reject these charges provided the committee reaches consensus on such charges.

STAFF TRAINING

A staff developer works closely with the principal and teachers to provide support and direction in the reorganization process.

PARENT TRAINING

1. for representation on the governance committee.
2. for effective support of the education of their children at home and in school.

EVALUATION REQUIREMENT

See Evaluation Plan at the end of this Prototype Section.

SYSTEMIC SCHOOL CHANGE AS A COMPREHENSIVE DROPOUT PREVENTION APPROACH

PROGRAM SOURCE: Department of Education

COST CONSIDERATIONS

Consultants; stipends; travel; substitutes; coordinator's salary; materials.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Systemic School Change seeks to fundamentally change traditional forms of school governance, organization, policies, programs and practices, with the goal of raising academic achievement, improving students' social and emotional development, enhancing the school climate, and expanding roles of staff, while providing individual and group support to those students who need it. Restructuring components include: a shared decision making form of school governance; flexible and supportive school policies; clustering and staff teaming; interdisciplinary curriculum; cooperative and peer group learning; heterogeneous and cross-age grouping of students; block and flexible scheduling; integration and teaming of Chapter I, special education, and bilingual education students into mainstream classes; student support teams; and partnerships with outside agencies to provide additional support services to students.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. To address more directly the school causal factors of low student achievement and school dropouts.
2. To adopt new school structures that raise student achievement, are responsive to how students learn, support the needs of the "whole child," and are more successful in keeping students in school through high school graduation.
3. To examine how a reorganization of current staffing and resources can better meet the needs of all students within a school building.
4. To reduce dropout rates and raise achievement rates.

PROGRAM SEQUENCE

1. School-wide team organized to facilitate a restructuring process.
2. School-wide assessment conducted to identify areas of strength and concern.
3. Visitations and staff development presentations made to acquaint school staff about successful restructuring initiatives.
4. Long-term school plan for restructuring developed.
5. Transition to a shared decision making model of school governance.
6. Components of the restructuring plan implemented, including:
   a. creating a mission statement that sets an expectation that all children can achieve at high levels;
   b. developing a school climate that respects and is sensitive to the diversity in background of all students represented in the school;

c. changing school policies that may contribute to low achievement and dropout rates (e.g., rigid academic punishment policy, grade retention as a common practice, in-school or out-of-school suspension used for minor infractions, widespread use of ability grouping) to be more supportive;
d. reorganizing the school structure, with emphasis on clustering, staff teaming, and the provision of common planning time for staff teams;
e. reducing pull-out remedial, Chapter I, and special education services, and the provision of these services within the regular education classroom through increased staff teaming;
f. increasing the use of heterogeneous rather than homogeneous grouping of students, and the use of cross-age, multi-grade grouping of students;
g. using flexible scheduling to more creatively use the school day;
h. developing interdisciplinary curriculum - including the integration of higher order thinking skills, reading and writing across the curriculum;
i. experimenting with innovative instructional strategies;
j. experimenting with new ways of grading and assessing student progress that rely more upon writing samples, exhibitions, and portfolios;
k. providing support services to at-risk and low-achieving students, including the creation of Student Support Teams to provide case management services and life issues programs;
l. developing meaningful parent involvement strategies;
m. designing creative staff development models and expanding roles of staff as vehicles to promote change;
n. collaborating with community resources to enhance programs and services.

STAFF TRAINING

Staff training is vital to the suctess of any restructuring initiative:
1. Ongoing training of the school-wide team and the larger staff in current restructuring and dropout prevention trends;
2. Visitations to schools that have undertaken restructuring initiatives resulting in lower dropout rates and higher achievement rates;
3. Common planning time (3-5 times weekly) for staff teams to develop interdisciplinary curriculum, monitor student progress and experiment with innovative instructional strategies;
4. Training to create Student Support Teams (case management structure), mentoring programs, and life issues programs.

PARENT TRAINING

1. Parents are included on the shared decision making governance team.
2. Parent training is given on how to better support their child(ren)'s education at home, on how to be an advocate for their child(ren) in school, and on developmental issues of children.

EVALUATION REQUIREMENT

See Evaluation Plan at the end of this Prototype Section.

DEVELOPMENTAL CLASSROOM IN AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

PROGRAM SOURCE: Joanne Russell, Early Learning Center, North Zone

COST CONSIDERATIONS

Full-time teacher; paraprofessional; parent coordinator; materials; consultants.

While this developmental classroom allows for 636 funding for a full-time teacher, it is not necessary if a full-time teacher is already available.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Based on an Early Learning Center model, a Developmental Classroom within an elementary school provides a child-centered developmentally appropriate full-day program to a mixed age group of 16 children ranging from 3 to 6 years. Children experience a whole language approach to literacy learning; form a concrete understanding of math concepts and the ability to apply them to real life situations; and develop appreciation and understanding of self and others.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. To provide a developmentally appropriate early childhood program to 16 children (bilingual, standard and special needs) ranging from 3 to 6 years.
2. To provide a strong program of professional support to the instructional team within the developmental classroom via administrative support and coaching, peer coaching, and other in-service training modules.
3. To encourage parental support and involvement in the young child's learning through parent-teacher conferences and parental participation in curriculum extensions, ex. Family Read-Aloud, Friendship Feast and Chinese New Year.

PROGRAM SEQUENCE

Identify teacher and paraprofessional, provide pre-service training, recruit early learners, create a classroom environment that addresses the developmental agenda, employ developmental curriculum and provide on-going in-service support, enlist parental support, implement and evaluate program.

STAFF TRAINING

Developmental Classroom staff participate in a pre-service training module and bi-monthly in-service workshops that focus on developing teachers who understand and are committed to a child-centered approach to early childhood education.

PARENT TRAINING

Within this early childhood model, parents are expected and encouraged to: be involved in their child(ren)'s educational program; receive training and support from the parent coordinator and from other parents; participate in classroom projects and meetings with their child(ren)'s instructional team.

EVALUATION REQUIREMENT

See Evaluation Plan at the end of this Prototype Section.

RESTRUCTURING: AN INTEGRATED CHILD-CENTERED APPROACH (ELEMENTARY)

PROGRAM SOURCE: Wheelock College

COST CONSIDERATIONS

Teacher stipends; substitutes; college specialists; consultants; materials.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Designed for elementary schools and teachers interested in implementing an integrated, child-centered approach to curriculum that meets the needs of a diverse student population. A college specialist visits participating schools one-two days/week to plan program and provide consultation, in-class support and demonstrations. Techniques include enriching the instruction of language arts through a "whole language" approach to literacy, incorporating experience-based activities and manipulatives into the math curriculum, designing interest areas in the classroom and developing integrated thematic units. Teachers share strategies for promoting child-centered experiences and have opportunities to visit other classrooms where these approaches are being implemented.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. To provide teachers with approaches to curriculum based on children's needs, developmental level, experience and interests in a diverse setting.
2. To promote an understanding of the philosophy of child-centered and developmentally appropriate teaching in a multi-cultural environment.

PROGRAM SEQUENCE

1. Identification and selection of participating schools.
2. Orientation and initial program planning with the Zone Superintendent and principals of targeted schools.
3. Identification and selection of participating teachers.
4. Notification of parents about project goals and techniques.
5. Initial in-service meeting to plan program with targeted teachers.
6. Implementation of program and ongoing support to teachers and parents.

STAFF TRAINING

On-site visits to provide consultation, in-class support and demonstrations in effective integration of program approach.

PARENT TRAINING

Parents will be notified of program goals and techniques involved, and receive training and materials enabling them to use compatible techniques at home.

EVALUATION REQUIREMENT

See Evaluation Plan at the end of this Prototype Section.

NEW RST06

RESTRUCTURING A MIDDLE SCHOOL

PROGRAM SOURCE: Mimi Forbes, Lewis Middle School

COST CONSIDERATIONS

Teacher stipends for summer training and after school, University partner, consultants and trainers, photocopy costs, transportation, conference fees.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program will familiarize teachers with current research and literature in effective middle schools. Through a program of year-long inservice training and support teachers and administrators will:

1. Study effective programs in the areas of middle school curriculum, strategies, techniques for parent outreach, team building and leadership;
2. Select strategies appropriate for their school population;
3. Implement selected strategies.

Program will require year-long consultant and training support. This training is designed to provide a comprehensive framework for integrating the academic curriculum with externally funded programs (state, federal, business, private funds) and community resources in order to serve children better. Program will begin in August with five days of intensive work.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. To provide teachers with leadership training.
2. To provide teachers with project implementation strategies.
3. To provide teachers with training in middle school curriculum strategies.
4. To provide administrators and teachers with a forum to work cooperatively on the determination of school direction and focus.

PROGRAM SEQUENCE

1. Hire teaching staff.
2. Review and select middle school literature.
3. Select and hire consultants.
4. Develop training schedule.
5. Implement program: workshops, consultant visits, staff training days.
6. On-going evaluation.

STAFF TRAINING/PARENT TRAINING

This is a staff training program, with a parent training component.

EVALUATION REQUIREMENT

See Evaluation Plan at the end of this Prototype Section.

RESTRUCTURING A HIGH SCHOOL

PROGRAM SOURCE: Marjorie Joyce, Chapter 636 Coordinator, High School Zone

COST CONSIDERATIONS

Consultants, stipends, materials, transportation, incentives.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This plan is based on the formation of a school team of administrators, teachers, parents and students to rethink and reorganize the structure of the traditional school in order to meet the diverse needs of all students. This school-based team will develop a long range plan for fundamental changes in areas of school management, programs, staff motivation, school climate, school leadership, decision making and any other area that will affect student learning and achievement. The school-based team will encourage the development of partnerships with community agencies, businesses, colleges, universities and local community leaders to help focus on successful and innovative school policies.

Team members will develop a process to implement lasting changes that consider the cultural and economic background of all the students including changes in programming, new learning and teaching strategies, more active parental ownership, and more flexible school policies for individual students. Emphasis should be on changes in organizational structure rather than on the addition of programs.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. To develop a school restructuring plan that will affect the educational quality and ensure equity for all students.
2. To form a school-based team to develop a long range plan for organizational and educational change.
3. To form an advisory council to help the school-based team develop implementation strategies.
4. To implement fundamental school changes that will result in improved student behavior, performance, learning and development, greater faculty performance and accountability and school-wide change in school climate.

PROGRAM SEQUENCE

1. A school-based team from the school community of people with clarity and vision will be formed.
2. The team will assess all areas of the school and develop a long range plan.
3. Outside consultants from DOE and collaborative agencies will be requested by the team to serve on an advisory council for school restructuring after the plan is developed.
4. Implementation strategies will be developed.

RST07

STAFF TRAINING

1. Workshops will be conducted for team members coordinated by the High School Zone Superintendent and teachers.
2. Time will be provided for team members to attend workshops and team meetings.
3. Training will focus on successful cases of restructuring, statistics, data collection and the selected bibliography used in the Massachusetts Department of Education position paper on SYSTEMIC SCHOOL CHANGE.

PARENT TRAINING

1. Parents who are team members will receive the same training as staff.
2. Team member parents will develop reports to inform all school parents of restructuring progress.

EVALUATION REQUIREMENT

See Evaluation Plan at the end of this Prototype Section.

COOPERATIVE LEARNING: A BASIS FOR CHANGE

PROGRAM SOURCE: Paula Clark, Northeastern University

COST CONSIDERATIONS

Stipends, consultants, materials, transportation, admissions, Higher Education participation.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

A cooperative learning approach will be developed and infused in all subject areas to create a positive learning environment and serve as a means of revitalization and change. The cooperative learning approach combines group goals or team rewards with individual accountability and equal opportunities for success. Team rewards serve as an effective support for providing peer assistance within small groups. Individual accountability ensures that all students take learning seriously and that no student's lack of mastery is hidden by the success of another. Equal opportunities for success make it apparent that the results of all students' efforts will be rewarded on their own merits. More consistent and organized student interaction promote higher achievement levels, develop better understanding of diversity and strengths, improve student self-esteem, and create a higher level of class and school unity, thus serving as a means for attracting and holding a broader student population. A rewards system for small group and/or class achievement in both academic and social areas are provided. The rewards system encourages the accomplishment of group or class goals, thus reducing negative impact of academic disparity, while supporting the development of a more dynamic and united student population. In conjunction with cooperative learning there is an increase in the use of manipulative and hands-on activities to better serve and respond to the varied learning styles of the student population. The cooperative learning approach will be phased in over a three year period, allowing continued assessment and revision while building a cohesive, attractive and high achieving school.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. To establish and implement a cooperative learning approach in all classrooms and subject areas.
2. To train teachers in cooperative learning techniques, while building a more cohesive faculty who share a common vision for the school.
3. To infuse the use of hands-on activities and manipulatives into the classroom in a variety of disciplines and subject areas.
4. To establish a reward system for students which fosters group cooperation and achievement.
5. To provide opportunities for parents to become involved in the cooperative learning process and to foster more parental involvement in achieving school unity and success.

PROGRAM SEQUENCE

1. A 5-day summer institute in cooperative learning, use of manipulatives and classroom management will provide instruction and planning time for 6th grade (or 1/3 of all) teachers. Training will continue during the school year to foster cooperation and interaction among teachers while assessing and expanding on strategies used in the classroom. The training process will be repeated each year until all teachers have been involved and cooperative learning has become an integral part of the school.
2. A cooperative learning approach will be used in all 6th grade (or 1/3 of all) classes and into other schoolwide activities as appropriate.
3. A rewards system for academic and social achievement in predetermined areas will be established. The rewards will serve as incentives for group achievement, thereby reducing the negative aspects of differing levels of achievement and skills development.
4. Parents will be informed of the new school focus and enhanced learning environment via workshops and mailings. Parents will be encouraged to work more closely together to support the school and its mission.

STAFF TRAINING

Staff training in cooperative learning and use of manipulatives will be the most essential component of success and change. Summer training institutes and scheduled meetings during the school year will also stress team building and cooperation among faculty members.

PARENT TRAINING

1. Parents will be trained to understand the benefits of cooperative learning.
2. Parents will be encouraged to incorporate cooperate learning strategies and techniques in working together to improve the offering and image of the school as it undergoes restructure and change.

EVALUATION REQUIREMENT

See the Evaluation Plan at the end of this Prototype Section.

ELEMENTS OF PROJECT PROMISE

PROGRAM SOURCE: Roger Harris, Principal, Timilty Middle School

COST CONSIDERATIONS

Staff overtime; consultant fees, materials.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Project Promise model has the traditional school day redesigned to permit each subject area to infuse reading, writing and math skills into the lessons. A flexible schedule is designed to include 37.8% more time in school with 90 extra minutes Monday - Thursday and 3 hours on Saturday mornings. Study skills are an integral part of the Project Promise day.

Staff development and strategic planning are program priorities. Teachers on each of the school's cluster teams have common planning time 3 times daily. Weekly instructional plans are designed during this time. Two hours of professional development time on Fridays allow consultants time to help staff learn and develop ways to improve the interdisciplinary approach to teaching.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Project Promise is designed to:
1. Improve the mathematics, reading, writing, speaking and critical thinking skills of middle school students;
2. Infuse geography into all curricula areas;
3. Utilize cooperative learning as a technique across the school;
4. Use interdisciplinary and team teaching as an approach to instruction in all academic areas;
5. Incorporate the writing process in all classes through the use of writing folders;
6. Help students who are functioning below average to move into the average range, to enable those who are average to become above average, to assist the above average to excel.

PROGRAM SEQUENCE

1. Planning - June
2. Workshops (all staff) - August
3. Classes begin
4. On-going in-service
5. Program Evaluation - May - June
6. Planning for following year - June

STAFF TRAINING

1. Extended day staff participate in in-service training on a regular basis. Areas of focus include writing across the curriculum, infusion of geography into the curriculum, cooperative learning, and models of instruction.
2. Staff as inservice presenters is also a very successful model.
3. Consultants provide on-going professional development in appropriate topics such as cooperative learning, process writing, interdisciplinary and team teaching.

PARENT TRAINING

Parents are included in the planning, implementation and evaluation of all components of Project Promise. Interpreters are contracted on an as needed basis. Parent Coordinators organize activities for students' families. Notices and parent newsletters serve as major vehicles for information as well as parent meetings, regular phone calls and open house.

EVALUATION REQUIREMENT

See Evaluation Plan at the end of this Prototype Section.

INTEGRATED SPECIAL/REGULAR EDUCATION: TEACHER SUPPORT TEAM PROJECT

PROGRAM SOURCE: Department of Education

COST CONSIDERATIONS

Stipends; consultants; materials; printing; substitutes; paraprofessionals; child care.

Interested schools should contact the Department of Education for information on possible funding through collaborating grant programs (Technical Assistance Mini-Grant Program, Teacher Support Team Project, Curriculum Seminars).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This is a program to integrate special education with regular education through a Building-Based Teacher Support Team that improves a school's capacity to educate students with special needs in the regular education environment. The team is a school-based problem-solving group of teachers who provide a vehicle for discussion of issues on learning and/or behavior that a regular classroom teacher is experiencing with particular students. The team serves as a resource to school staff, assessing the special needs of students in the regular education program, and recommending intervention strategies to the teacher who has identified students in need of support. Specific changes within the student's educational plan (IEP), if suggested by the team, must be processed through the evaluation team review process. Building leadership is essential to the success of this program.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. To provide regular classroom teachers with a vehicle to discuss learning and behavioral problems of particular students in their classrooms.
2. To assist teachers in using new models of support and strategies for student learning within a school building.
3. To help principals, teachers, students, and parents develop greater acceptance of individual differences.
4. To enable principals and teachers to identify and meet staff development needs.
5. To enable a school to develop and/or restructure resources which can be used as alternatives to placement in special education for at-risk and/or difficult to teach students. This approach reduces "pull out" for special education, remedial reading, speech, language, Chapter I, etc.

RST10

PROGRAM SEQUENCE

1. Team is identified, trained, supported by principal.
2. Team provides school staff with information about purpose/function of team.
3. Teacher contacts Building-Based Support Team with a referral.
4. Building-Based Support Team coordinator or team reviews case (can schedule classroom visit or request more information.
5. Teacher and team hold problem solving meeting.
6. Team makes recommendations to classroom teacher and sets follow-up meeting.
7. Teacher implements recommendation and monitors student's progress. Support provided to teacher as needed.
8. Follow-up meeting is conducted.

STAFF TRAINING

The team is trained in the model by a consultant or other team that has implemented a Building-Based Support team approach to the integration of special education and regular education.

PARENT TRAINING

1. Parents are trained in learning activities they can apply at home.
2. Parents become sensitive to the issues of special needs students in an integrated classroom.

EVALUATION REQUIREMENT

See Evaluation Plan at the end of this Prototype Section.

INTEGRATIVE BILINGUAL EDUCATION

PROGRAM SOURCE: Department of Education

COST CONSIDERATIONS

Release time or stipends for the School Integration Team; consultants; conference fees.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Integrative Bilingual Education is an innovative approach to bilingual educational programming. Its major goal is to provide equal educational opportunity for linguistic minority students who are in Bilingual Education Programs. The approach is characterized by the restructuring of the school to allow for the partial or full integration of bilingual and monolingual students. Bilingual students participate in mainstream English classroom activities as often as is appropriate based on individual student's academic and language development goals. The approach requires that:

1. curriculum sequence of bilingual and regular education programs is parallel, allowing bilingual students to transfer into mainstream classes as often as is appropriate;
2. scheduling of bilingual classes and activities is compatible with the mainstream class schedule, maximizing the possibility for integrative activities;
3. bilingual teachers and regular teachers have an opportunity to collaborate on planning, team-teaching and mutual support;
4. the monolingual teachers and students see bilingual students, teachers and parents as members of the school community rather than as a separate school within the school; and
5. the mainstream teacher is able to use appropriate instructional strategies to teach to the strengths of linguistic minority students while maintaining a high expectation level for their academic achievement.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. To provide bilingual students with equal educational opportunities.
2. To provide bilingual students with the opportunity to continue academic growth in their first language while developing their English skills in a supportive environment.
3. To restructure every day school operations to maximize the opportunity for the integration of bilingual and monolingual students.
4. To improve school climate.
5. To provide for team teaching between bilingual and non-bilingual teachers.
6. To recognize the cultural diversity of the linguistic minority students.
7. To train mainstream teachers to teach linguistic minority students effectively by identifying their needs and incorporating strategies for addressing them in the teaching methodology.

RST11

PROGRAM SEQUENCE

1. Prior to implementation of this program a School Integration Team should be formed to:
   a. Study, research, and observe similar programs in place in either Massachusetts or other states;
   b. Organize other school staff around the planning and implementation of the model;
   c. Plan and design the school's approach to student recruitment and grouping, parent involvement, curriculum design, teaching approaches, etc.
2. The School Integration Team is trained with support from the principal.
3. The team provides school staff and parents with information on the implementation of the model.
4. Planning time is established for the development of a master schedule for the school to insure integration of bilingual and regular education.
5. Plans are implemented.

STAFF TRAINING

Training will include:
1. first and second language acquisition methodology;
2. instructional strategies to insure that the whole school curriculum is multicultural;
3. instructional strategies which teach to students' strengths while maintaining high expectations for their ability to achieve academically.

PARENT TRAINING

Parents will participate in training related to:
1. cultural diversity and its implications for educational programming;
2. role of linguistic minority parents in strengthening the school curriculum.

EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

See Evaluation Plan at the end of this Prototype Section.

TWO-WAY BILINGUAL PROGRAM (ALL LEVELS)

SY88-89 PROGRAM INFORMATION

DISTRICT	SCHOOL	GRADE	PARTNER	TOTAL COST	PER PUPIL COST
A	M Curley	7	NONE	$ 6,000	$ 27
E	Mackey	6-8	Mass College of Pharmacy		
	Hernandez	1-5	Wheelock College Lesley College	111,491	161

SY89-90 Program not selected.

COST CONSIDERATIONS

Teacher stipends; consultants; paraprofessionals; bilingual parent liaison; transportation; and materials.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

A Two-Way Bilingual Program, applicable at any grade from K to 12, promotes bilingualism for two language groups. Reciprocal language enrichment provides for native language maintenance while fostering second language learning. The program should involve approximately equal numbers of native speakers of each language. Staffing may include teachers and paraprofessionals, with care taken to ensure sufficient bilingual representation among both groups. All academic subjects will be offered, with team teaching highly encouraged. All students' language proficiency and academic progress will be assessed and monitored by the in-school Language Assessment Team (LAT). Parents will play an active role and be called upon as resources in classes related to areas where they have experience. They will also be kept informed in their native/dominant language. A bilingual parent will serve as a liaison to parents, interpret for parents and participate in SPC and School Improvement Council. Consultants with specific expertise in teaching content to two-way bilingual students, will train all staff in relevant curriculum approaches. Technical assistance and training will be supplemented by the Office of Citywide Bilingual Programs. If this program involves only part of a school, orientation will be provided for the entire school regarding its goals and approaches.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. To develop and implement a Two-Way Bilingual Program at specified grade levels which provides for maintenance of native language and learning of, and in, a second language by all students in all BPS subject areas.
2. To assess student language proficiency in first and second language, and formulate appropriate recommendations in collaboration with the in-school Language Assessment Team (LAT).
3. To implement the program to reflect the students' cultural background and proficiency in both languages, the community setting, the participation of parents, and the curriculum objectives.

4. To orient the total school faculty and parents regarding the goals and methods of the program.

PROGRAM SEQUENCE

1. Planning.
2. Workshops for teachers and paraprofessionals, curriculum planning.
3. Classes begin, orientation for all staff and parents.
4. Ongoing in-service curriculum planning and review.
5. Ongoing parent participation and cultural activities.
6. Planning for following year.

STAFF TRAINING

All Two-Way staff will participate in ongoing in-service training on first and second language acquisition techniques, multicultural teaching strategies, materials selection, acquisition, development of curriculum approaches for teaching content in native languages. Training will also focus on testing, appropriate mainstreaming strategies and parent communication. Training in first and second language acquisition will be provided to all staff.

PARENT TRAINING

Parents will receive services, training, and a newsletter from the Bilingual Parent Liaison about school activities and the Two-Way program. ESL and SSL workshops will also be provided, possibly in conjunction with the Zone Parent Information Center. Special focus will be providing sufficient and appropriate orientation, individually and in small groups to help parents to identify skills they have to offer students, and to enable them to share these with the students in classroom activities.

EVALUATION REQUIREMENT

See the Evaluation Plan at the end of this Prototype Section.

COMMENT ON REVISION

NOTE: This Prototype is also available in the Restructuring Prototype Section.

TWO-WAY BILINGUAL EARLY CHILDHOOD PROJECT (K-3)

SY89-90 PROGRAM INFORMATION

ZONE	SCHOOL	GRADE	PARTNER	TOTAL COST	PER PUPIL COST
EAST	Russell	1-5	None	$ 8,750	$ 109
WEST	Hernandez	1-5	Wheelock College	$ 25,470	$ 268
	Sumner	K-5	None	$ 39,487	$1,316

COST CONSIDERATIONS

Teachers; training; and materials.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

A two-way bilingual early childhood program promotes bilingualism for two language groups. This program will provide K-3 students with a developmentally appropriate curriculum in both English and another language. Reciprocal language enrichment provides for native language maintenance while fostering second language learning. It will include approximately equal numbers of native speakers of each language. Extended day K-3 students who participate in the TWEC project will attend both a morning and afternoon session. One session may be conducted entirely in English, and the other in another language. The curriculum will be coordinated to ensure that students are covering similar content in both sessions. Early childhood education guidelines relevant to mainstreamed special education students will be observed. At each grade level appropriate activities to promote cultural understanding will be included.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. To help students learn a second language and to learn in a second language.
2. To foster student, staff, and parent appreciation of different cultures and languages.
3. To help students achieve the goals of the K-3 curriculum in two languages.
4. To develop activities to help parents become more involved in their children's education.

PROGRAM SEQUENCE

1. Assessment of language proficiency and achievement in the content are in native and second language by the in-school Language Assessment Team and curriculum planning for September.
2. Workshops for teachers on two-way early childhood curriculum, student placement, assessments, development of ongoing staff development calendar.
3. Classes begin - weekly Cluster meetings, parent open house.
4. Language Assessment Team meeting organization.

5. Multicultural festivals, field trips in the communities where the languages are spoken for better understanding of how people live and other activities to promote cross-cultural interaction.
6. Staff Curriculum workshops.
7. Mid-Year student assessments.
8. Ongoing program evaluations, workshops, student assessments.

STAFF TRAINING

All staff will participate in in-service training on two-way and early childhood curriculum, Lau compliance, testing, and parent communication/involvement. Training in second language acquisition strategies and methodology will be provided to all staff. Training will include issues of self-concept development, selection/adaptation/development of culturally imbedded curriculum.

PARENT TRAINING

Parents will receive services, training, and a newsletter about school activities and the Two-Way program. ESL and SSL workshops, and orientation on ways to contribute to school programs will be provided.

EVALUATION REQUIREMENT

See the Evaluation Plan at the end of this Prototype Section.

COMMENT ON REVISION

NOTE: this Prototype is also available in the Restructuring Prototype Section.

FAMILY/SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS (COMER MODEL)

PROGRAM SOURCE: Simmons College

COST CONSIDERATIONS

Consultants; materials; stipends; transportation; child care; refreshments.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

A whole school/school climate program that seeks to better school performance through shared belief in the value of education among teachers, parents and students, the Comer model requires that schools be managed by an active partnership of school staff and students' parents. Parents, teachers and administrators learn together the Comer principles, collaborative management skills and developmental needs of students, then design and implement changes in school curriculum, routine operations and practices. The goal is shared value and trust and a school climate characterized by personal concern, nurturing and belief in students' abilities and responsibilities. Desired outcomes include substantial increase in students' self-esteem and academic performance.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. Involve parents in their children's education and school life.
2. Learn and apply the Comer principles to assessing needs and planning change.
3. Develop common values and mutually approved practices and activities.
4. Change the school's curriculum and operational procedures to reflect the Comer principles.

PROGRAM SEQUENCE

1. Attend BPS/ORC/Simmons College Comer Conference on April 6, 1990.
2. Identify administrators, teachers, parents, space and time for the program.
3. Orient staff, parents and students to the program and its goals.
4. Begin joint staff/parent learning and continue throughout the year.
5. Assess school curriculum and operations, plan changes.
6. Implement changes, including parental involvement activities and on-site consultation/coaching.
7. Chart progress in improving students' self esteem and academic performance.

STAFF/PARENT TRAINING

1. Having parents, teachers and administrators learn, plan and chart progress together is the core of the program. Three to four retreats and weekly meetings are suggested.
2. There is a network of Comer schools and training material available including experienced schools/consultants, videotapes, manuals.

EVALUATION REQUIREMENT

See Evaluation Plan at the end of this Prototype Section.

NEW RST15

FAMILY LITERACY: PARENTS AND CHILDREN LEARNING TOGETHER

PROGRAM SOURCE: Department of Education; Adult Literary Resources Institute

COST CONSIDERATIONS

Variable. Interested schools should request technical assistance from the Department of Education. Innovative models may be funded collaboratively through Adult Basic Education (ABE) and Chapter I.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Family Literacy programs attempt to break the cycle of intergenerational illiteracy by working with both parents and their children, brought together for varied academic programs where they practice reading and other basic academic skills independently and with one another. Family literacy programs are based on the recognition that homes in which parents read and write tend to have children who also read and write. Theoretical concepts emerge in practice in techniques that stress interaction, ex., paired reading, read-alongs and story hours, peer group discussions of reading with practice and a variety of other socially oriented techniques. Emphasis is on activities and skills that parents learn at school and practice at home. Pilot programs appropriate the the specific school site may be developed by ABE teachers, early childhood educators, Chapter I and 636 staff.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. To help adults in need of literacy training to develop and practice their literacy skills so that they can:
   a. build self-esteem and provide positive role models for their children;
   b. reinforce reading, writing and math behaviors/skills at home as a family.
2. To develop collaborative models between K-12 educators and school or community based adult basic educators.

PROGRAM SEQUENCE

1. Meetings between ABE teachers and elementary teachers (including Chapter I, Early Childhood, Chapter 636) to determine appropriate program design.
2. Development of program activities and determination of schedule: content, frequency, home-based follow-up.
3. Identification of participants and development of parent/teacher/student learning contracts.

STAFF/PARENT TRAINING

Central focus is on parent training with collaborative training for ABE teachers, early childhood educators and other appropriate staff.

EVALUATION REQUIREMENT

See Evaluation Plan at the end of this Prototype Section.

RESTRUCTURING FOR FAMILY LEARNING

PROGRAM SOURCE: Boston Partners in Education;
Citywide Parents Council;
Elementary Math and Technology (EMAT);
Department of Education.

COST CONSIDERATIONS

Consultants; stipends; transportation; child care; printing; supplies; translation; refreshments.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

A school may restructure by extending educational services to the parents of its enrolled students. A school adopting this restructuring model will develop an on-going adult education component to its programming, providing parents an opportunity to take a variety of academic courses. Regularly scheduled workshops or courses for parents may include but are not limited to:

- English As a Second Language
- Computer Literacy
- Reading Aloud
- Physical and Mental Health Issues
- Writing
- Parenting Skills
- Spanish
- Family Math/EMAT
- Math

An essential component of the Family Learning Model is training parents to use the newly acquired academic skills to help their children learn more effectively. When appropriate, parents may assist teachers in their children's classrooms following completion of their course work. In some cases parents may work towards acquiring a GED.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. Improve the learning of children by involving their parents in the learning process.
2. Increase parents' effectiveness in determining their children's needs and obtaining appropriate services.
3. Increase parents content area skills to help their children with schoolwork.
4. Increase parents self-confidence as partners in educating their children.
5. Expand the services provided by the school.

PROGRAM SEQUENCE

1. Form a parent outreach team to identify and orient participants.
2. Establish a higher education and/or business partnership to help facilitate the process.
3. Plan schedule, curriculum, and teaching approaches for program implementation
4. Implement Family Learning model.
5. Conduct follow-up/support activities.

STAFF TRAINING

Not Applicable

EVALUATION REQUIREMENT

See the Evaluation Plan at the end of this Prototype Section.

SCHOOL/COMMUNITY PARENT OUTREACH

PROGRAM SOURCE: Department of Education

COST CONSIDERATIONS

Consultants; stipends; materials; substitutes; childcare; transportation; parent liaison and outreach worker; translation.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

A commitment to involve all parents, including single parent, working, ethnic and language minority families, will require a planned and coordinated total school and community effort. A successful outreach effort may include:

1. Innovative modes of communicating to parents through practices such as:
   a. Home visits by teachers accompanied by community leaders and case workers who are familiar with the families;
   b. A positive phone program contacting all parents and/or a parents hotline with appropriate language translation;
   c. Neighborhood walks which help to bridge the gap between home and school by having teachers visit neighborhoods to talk informally with parents and other family members;
   d. A parent information van that brings information to families about the school by making regularly scheduled stops at local stores and health clinics and in neighborhoods.
2. Partnerships between the school and other community organizations that are in touch with the parents that the school is trying to reach:
   a. Job training programs can incorporate parenting sessions and orientations to the schools;
   b. Workshops at local community centers can provide information and materials for home learning projects for parents and children;
   c. School "drop in centers" located in health clinics, Department of Social Services offices and other places that parents may need to go on a regular basis can encourage parents to support their children's education;
   d. Parent-child reading and learning sessions held on weekends at public libraries, community or cultural centers and other neighborhood settings can provide intergenerational learning experiences.
3. Logistical support to lower the barriers to involvement among hard-to-reach parents such as:
   a. Translation services
   b. Parent resource rooms that provide a "space" for parent involvement activities and provide parents with materials and ideas for supporting their children's education.
   c. On-site childcare services at open houses, parent teacher conferences and other school events.

These examples are illustrative only. They do not list all of the possible and necessary outreach strategies.

RST17

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. To extend the benefits of parent involvement on academic achievement to all children, especially those who are academically at-risk.
2. To provide expanded opportunities for all parents to gain the knowledge, skills and confidence that will enable them to become involved in their children's education.
3. To promote a more inclusive base of parent involvement in school decision making so that participants are more broadly representative of the diversity of the school's student population.

PROGRAM SEQUENCE

1. A schoolwide meeting of staff and already active parents identifies the schools' vision for parent involvement and areas of concern.
2. A planning and implementation team consisting of teachers, parents and collaborating community agency representatives assesses the needs of non-participating parents and current parent involvement practices at school.
3. Visitations and staff development presentations are made to acquaint school staff about successful parent outreach initiatives.
4. A plan for parent outreach, parent training and education and parent empowerment through logistical support is developed.
5. Incentives and enabling services that promote involvement of all families with the school and in their children's education are implemented.
6. Base-line measures of the current status of parent involvement are developed and used for periodic review and evaluation of new parent involvement initiatives.

STAFF TRAINING

The following areas of training will prove useful:

1. Ongoing training of the school-community team on successful outreach initiatives and on the process of building school and community agency partnerships;
2. Training for all teaching staff on:
   a. School and community based barriers to parent involvement;
   b. Activities that promote parental involvement in their children's learning in the school and in the home.

PARENT TRAINING

Parent training can be provided on:

1. How to better support their children's education in the home;
2. Other services in the community that can strengthen the family and children's well-being;
3. Knowledge and skills needed for parents to be more effective advocates for their children and more effective participants on advisory and decision making bodies at the school;
4. Other areas as identified in the needs assessment.

EVALUATION REQUIREMENT

See Evaluation Plan at the end of this Prototype Section.